The Church of England Pulpit,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY
283.05
CHUO
v.27

THE

Church of England Pulpit,

AND

Ecclesiastical Review.

JANUARY TO JUNE, 1889.

VOL. XXVII.

LONDON:
"CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE, 160 FLEET STREET, E.C.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXVII.

SERMONS ON :— PAGE

The Advent Hope—By Rev. H. C. Shuttleworth... 1
Bicentenary of the Shutting of the Gates of Derry—By Rev. R. R. Kane, LL.D. 13
Agnosticism—By Rev. G. Herbert Curteis, M.A. ... 16
Manifestations of God—By Rev. James B. Keene, M.A. 25
Many Infallible Proofs.—Acts i. 3—By Rev. A. E. Clarke, B.A. 28
The Bible—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. 37
Revelation and Science—By Rev. Prebendary Bassett 49
Job and Ecclesiastes.—A Contrast—By Rev. G. Bladon 52
Notes for Children's Sermon—By Rev. H. G. Rosedale... 55
Renunciation of Self in Teaching—By Rev. C. T. Ovenden, B.D. 61
The Last Will and Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ—By Rev. A. E. Clarke, B.A. 63
A New Year Sermon—By Rev. J. W. Kaye ... 65
Providence—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. ... 73
The Knowledge of God—By Rev. W. A. Cutting, M.A. 77
The Gospel of the Kingdom—By Rev. Canon Rawstorne, M.A. 85
The Wise Choice—By Rev. John J. Coleman, M.A. 88
The Ark of the Covenant—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. 97
Proportion in Christian Faith and Action—By Rev. Edmond Warre, D.D. 109
Religion and Social Enjoyments—By Rev. W. Kerr-Smith, M.A. 111
The Faith of Abraham—By Rev. W. Done Bushell, M.A. 121
The Hardening of the Heart—By Rev. Prof. Henslow, M.A. 123
St. Paul's Charge—By Rev. Thomas Jordan, D.D. 133
Christ Bearing our Sins—By Rev. Hamilton Stuart Verschoyle, M.A.... 135
Christian Comfort: What is it?—By Rev. J. P. Sandlands, M.A. 145
Christianity and Science—By Rev. J. J. Dillon, B.D. 148
Now—By Rev. R. C. Nugent Kelly, M.A. ... 157
The Office of a Deacon—By Rev. J. Hewitt, M.A.... 159
Christian Hopefulness—By Rev. R. Dixon... ... 161
Neutrality in Matters of Religion—By Rev. Canon Ovenden, B.D. 169
Clericalism—By Rev. Julius Lloyd, M.A. 171
Repentance—By Rev. R. Dixon 173
A Nineteenth Century Reformation—By Rev. Professor T. G. Bonney, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S. ... 181
St. Patrick—By Rev. R. R. Kane, LL.D. 183
The Christian Ministry—By late Bishop of Lincoln 193

SERMONS ON :— PAGE

Characteristics of the Christian Life—By Rev. J. W. Kaye, M.A. 198
Funeral Reform—By Rev. H. N. Grimley, M.A.... 205
The Divine Grasp—By Rev. George Jannings, M.A. 208
Evidences of the Resurrection of our Lord—By Rev. Dr. Maclear 217
The Year's Record—By Rev. R. C. Nugent Kelly, M.A. 222
Peace—Its Helps and Hindrances—By Rev. A. Wyndham Clampett, M.A. 229
The Two-fold Test of Religious Truths—By Rev. Hamilton Stuart Verschoyle, M.A. 231
The Whole is Greater than its Part—By Rev. R. C. Nugent Kelly, M.A. 235
The Church of Ireland—By Rev. George Salmon, D.D. 241
Rest—By Rev. Edward A. W. Seymour, M.A. ... 244
Heredity—By Rev. G. Bladon, B.A. 246
Balaam and his Motives—By Hon. and Rev. Edward Lyttelton, M.A 253
The Humiliation of Christ—By Rev. J. W. Kaye, M.A. 255
Is Faith a Failure?—By Rev. R. C. Nugent Kelly, M.A. 257
The Christian Passover—By Rev. J. W. Kaye, M.A. 265
Definiteness—By Rev. R. C. Nugent Kelly, M.A. 267
The Evening of the Resurrection—By Rev. James A. Carr, LL.D. 269
The Resurrection—By the Bishop of Meath ... 277
The Miracles of Apostolic and Mediæval Times—By Rev. Professor T. G. Bonney, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S. 281
The Dignity of Work—By Rev. L. R. Rawnsley, M.A. 289
Pentecost—By Rev. Canon Rawstorne, M.A. ... 301
The Wisdom that is from Above—By Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D. 304
Christian Union—By Rev. Thomas B. Naylor, B.D. 306

SERMONS BY :—

Late Bishop of Lincoln—The Christian Ministry ... 193
Bishop of Meath—The Resurrection... 277
Bassett, Rev. Prebendary—Revelation and Science 49
Bladon, Rev. G.—Job and Ecclesiastes.—A Contrast 52
Bladon, Rev. G., B.A.—Heredity 246
Bonney, Rev. Professor T. G., D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S.—A Nineteenth Century Reformation ... 181
Bonney, Rev. Professor T. G., D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S.—The Miracles of Apostolic and Mediæval Times 281
Bushell, Rev. W. D., M.A.—The Faith of Abraham 121
Carr, Rev. James A., LL.D.—The Evening of the Resurrection 269

283.05
CHU
V.24

SERMONS BY :— PAGE

Clampett, Rev. A. Wyndham, M.A.—Peace—its Helps and Hindrances 229
Clarke, Rev. A. E., B.A.—Many Infallible Proofs.—Acts i. 3... 28
Clarke, Rev. A. E., B.A.—The Last Will and Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ 63
Coleman, Rev. John J., M.A.—The Wise Choice... 88
Curteis, Rev. G. Herbert, M.A.—Agnosticism ... 16
Cutting, Rev. W. A., M.A.—The Knowledge of God... 77
Dillon, Rev. J. J., B.D.—Christianity and Science 148
Dixon, Rev. R.—Christian Hopefulness 161
Dixon, Rev. R.—Repentance 173
Grimley, Rev. H. N., M.A.—Funeral Reform ... 205
Henslow, Rev. Prof., M.A.—The Hardening of the Heart 123
Hewitt, Rev. James, M.A.—The Office of Deacon 159
Jannings, Rev. George, M.A.—The Divine Grasp 208
Jordan, Rev. Thomas, D.D.—St. Paul's Charge ... 133
Kane, Rev. R. R., LL.D.—Bicentenary of the Shutting of the Gates of Derry 13
Kane, Rev. R. R., LL.D.—St. Patrick 183
Kaye, Rev. J. W.—A New Year Sermon 65
Kaye, Rev. J. W., M.A.—Characteristics of the Christian Life 198
Kaye, Rev. J. W., M.A.—The Humiliation of Christ 255
Kaye, Rev. J. W., M.A.—The Christian Passover 265
Keene, Rev. James B., M.A.—Manifestations of God... 25
Kelly, Rev. R. C. Nugent, M.A.—Now 157
Kelly, Rev. R. C. Nugent, M.A.—The Year's Record... 222
Kelly, Rev. R. C. Nugent, M.A.—The Whole is Greater than its Part 235
Kelly, Rev. R. C. Nugent, M.A.—Is Faith a Failure? 257
Kelly, Rev. R. C. Nugent, M.A.—Definiteness ... 267
Kerr-Smith, Rev. W., M.A.—Religion and Social Enjoyments 111
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Bible 37
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—Providence 73
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Ark of the Covenant 97
Lloyd, Rev. Julius, M.A.—Clericalism 171
Lyttelton, Hon. and Rev. Edward, M.A.—Balaam and his Motives 253
Maclear, Rev. Dr.—Evidences of the Resurrection of our Lord 217
Naylor, Rev. Thomas B., B.D.—Christian Union... 306
Ovenden, Rev. C. T., B.D.—Renunciation of Self in Teaching 61
Ovenden, Rev. Canon, B.D.—Neutrality in Matters of Religion... 169
Plummer, Rev. Alfred, D.D.—The Wisdom that is from Above 304
Rawnsley, Rev. L. R., M.A.—The Dignity of Work 289
Rawstorne, Rev. Canon, M.A.—The Gospel of the Kingdom 85
Rawstorne, Rev. Canon, M.A.—Pentecost 301
Rosedale, Rev. H. G.—Notes for Children's Sermon 55
Salmon, Rev. George, D.D.—The Church of Ireland 241
Sandlands, Rev. J. P., M.A.—Christian Comfort: What is it? 145
Seymour, Rev. Edward A. W., M.A.—Rest ... 244
Shuttleworth, Rev. H. C.—The Advent Hope ... 1
Verschoyle, Rev. Hamilton Stuart, M.A.—Christ Bearing our Sins 135
Verschoyle, Rev. Hamilton Stuart, M.A.—The Two fold Test of Religious Truths 231
Warre, Rev. Edmond, D.D.—Proportion in Christian Faith and Action 109

LEADING ARTICLES :— PAGE

Concerning Churchwardens 6, 19, 55
Episcopal Autocracy 31
Islam, of the Sword 42
Graven Images 67
The Colonial Episcopate 79
Italy's Increasing Burdens 91
The Angels of the Churches 103
Object-Lessons from Hawarden 114
Working-Men's Clubs 127
African Barbarity 137
Thrift and Life Assurance 153
The Direction of Vital Energy 164
Country Labourers' Cottages 175
Church and Sect 187
Progress and Poverty 200
A Good Friday Meditation 200
The New Code... ... ... 211, 224, 237
Not Godless Peace 225
The Literature of the Day 249
Charity not Charity 260
Charity 271
Aunt or Stepmother 272
Clandestine Marriages... 273
The Ecclesiastical Trials 284
Christian Evidence Society 284
The Reredos on its Trial 292
Comus Circa Sacra 309

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR ... 6, 20, 32, 44, 56, 69, 80, 92, 104, 114, 128, 138, 153, 163, 176, 213, 226, 238, 261, 272

PAPERS :—

Maintenance of Voluntary and Elementary Schools—By Rev. H. Row 3
The Practical Observance and Moral Obligation of the Fourth Commandment—By Rev. Brownlow Maitland 8
Ireland Since the Union—By Rev. Thomas B. Naylor, B.D. 9, 32, 44, 80
Leprosy in India 20
Religious Animosity—By W. Walters, Esq., B.A. 105, 116, 128, 139
Modern Biblical Criticism—By Rev. Brownlow Maitland 154
A Clergyman's Secular Reading—By Rev. E. A. Wesley 165, 177, 188
The Confessional in the Christian Church—By Rev. Marshall C. Vincent, M.A. 293

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :—

"Christianity According to Christ"—By J. Monro Gibson, D.D. 11
"*The Expositor*" ... 22, 83, 117, 178, 226, 285
"*The Treasury*" 22
"*The Theological Monthly*" 23
"With the Immortals"—By Marian Crawford ... 57
"Theological Essays"—By Rev. H. Hutton, M.A. 57
"The Gospel according to St. Luke"—By J. Oswald Dykes, D.D. 69
"The Holy Scriptures in Ireland One Thousand Years Ago"—By Rev. Thomas Olden... ... 70
"The Golden Cord" 70
"An Easy Catechism for Members of the Church of Ireland"—By Rev. Robert Stoney 70
"The Sermon Bible." Vol. II. 94
"A Manual for Holy Days"—By F. C. Woodhouse, M.A. 94
"The Coming of the Friars, and other Historic Essays"—By Rev. A. Jessopp, D.D. 118
"The Epistle to the Hebrews"—By F. Rendall, M.A. 140
"An Inquiry into the Basis of Christian Unity—By Rev. S. Kettlewell, M.A. 141
"Egg Cookery. One hundred and fifty ways of Cooking and Serving Eggs" 178

988261

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :— PAGE

"Jesus Christ the Divine Man: His Life and Times"—By Rev. F. J. Vallings, M.A. ... 190
"Efficiency of Irish Schools Proved and Explained"—By Maurice C. Hime, M.A., LL.D.... ... 213
"The Pastoral Epistles"—By Rev. Alfred Plummer, M.A.. LL.D. 213
"The Sermon Bible." Vol. III. 250
"The Prose Works of the Right Rev. Thomas Ken, of Bath and Wells" 276
"An Answer to the Objections to the Divinity of Jesus Christ"—By Mr. F. Parker 285

CORRESPONDENCE :—

The Proposed *Eirenikon* 12
Toleration 23
Mr. Lawrence and the *Eirenikon* 23, 46
Irish Glebes 24
John x. 16 35
Athanasian Creed 47
The Black Rubric 47
Trinity College, Dublin 58, 83, 107
St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel.—By H. H. Evans 59
The Fourth Article 59, 70
Refusal of the Sacrament 71
The Real Presence 71, 107
Is Jonah's History Real or a Fable?... 71, 83, 95, 106
The Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland ... 84
The Theology of the New Spanish Prayer-Book ... 94
The Bishop of Lincoln.. 119
The Sign of Jonah the Prophet 119, 131, 142, 156
Candid Friends and Kind Critics 130
The Very Words of Scripture Given Up 132
The Miracle at Cana of Galilee 142
Hooker on the Presence 166
Church Law Dependent on State Law 167
Is all Old Testament History a Myth or a Fairy Tale? 167
Biblical Criticism 178
Rev. R. Dixon's Sermon 179, 202, 227
Remarks on a Sermon... ... ... 179, 311
The Barbican Mission to the Jews 180
God's Sovereignty 190, 250
The Criticisms 191
Gallio and St. Peter 191
The Book of Jonah 192, 201
Burial and Cremation 202
The Ministry of Evil ... 214, 226, 251, 263, 274, 287
What is the Cause of all our Divisions 215, 239, 261
Professor Bonney's Sermon 215
Gratuitous Scepticism 251
Acts xxiv. 20, 21 251
The Use of the Apocrypha 263
Robert Elsmere 275
The Recent General Synod in Dublin 275
Clandestine Marriages 285, 298
Prayers to the Second Person of the Trinity ... 287

CORRESPONDENCE :— PAGE

The Fatherhood of God 299, 310
Watchman, What of the Night 299
The Authorship of the Third Gospel and of the Acts 312

POETRY :—

The Voices of the Past (Percy Russell) 36
Infancy (Joseph John Murphy) 36
The Inauguration of the Organ at the Harvest Festival in Glatton Church, Hunts, 1888 (C. I. G.) 72
Immortal Love (M.) 287
Hymn 288

MISCELLANEOUS :—

The Rev. A. H. Delmé-Radcliffe at Cambridge ... 15
Bishop of Peterborough's Description of his Diocese 18
The Dean of Rochester on Temperance 24
Bishop Webber on the Diocese of Brisbane... ... 31
Burial Reform Association and Cremation 36
A Fellowship in Theology at Magdalen College, Oxford 43
Annual Meeting and Dinner of Old Oakhamists ... 47
East London Church Fund 48
Lectures at Wycliffe Hall and Pusey House ... 60
Mansfield College, Oxford 60
Enthronement of Bishop Stubbs 67
A Missionary Breakfast at Oxford 78
Sequestration of Llandegfan with Beaumaris ... 95
Medical, Scientific, and Musical Conversazione ... 95
The London Diocesan Conference 107
Central African Mission 126
Professor Cheyne on "The Composition and History of the Psalter" 126
The New Bishop of St. Asaph 144
The late John Watson, J.P., of Nottingham ... 152
The Church Missionary Society 192
The Church and the Jews 203
Christian Evidence Society 284
The Professorships of Greek and Divinity at Cambridge 215, 288
Rev. W. J. Scott, Rector of Spitalfields 223
Burial Reform Association 228
Church Emigration Society 248
Archdeacon Sheringham's Charge 252
Dean Owen 260, 308
Robertson Smith and the Chair of Arabic ... 271, 308
Oxford Mission to Calcutta 271
Bishop of Worcester 292

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312

CLERICAL OBITUARY 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312

The Church of England Pulpit
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Vol. XXVII.—No. 680. SATURDAY, JANUARY 5, 1889. PRICE ONE PENNY.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE ADVENT HOPE.

BY THE REV. H. C. SHUTTLEWORTH, RECTOR OF ST. NICHOLAS COLE ABBEY, AND LECTURER AT KING'S COLLEGE.

SERMON PREACHED ON THE SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT, DECEMBER 9TH, 1888.

"That we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope."—ROMANS xv. 4.

ADVENT is not by any means a season of mere apprehension of judgment, of terror at the proclamation that the Day of the Lord is at hand. It is a time, indeed, for solemn and sober making ready, for sweeping and cleansing the house of the human soul, for eager and careful preparation. It is a time, indeed, when the spiritual sleeper may hear the thunder of the warning trumpet, "Awake, thou that sleepest . . . . and Christ shall give thee light"! It is a time for all this, undoubtedly. But that which inspires the energy of preparation, that which takes from the waiting-time its sense of weariness, of dulness, of disappointment—is Hope. And the Epistle for this second Sunday is carefully chosen, in order to give us this note of expectant joy, following the note of solemn, of even tremendous warning which was sounded by the Church last Sunday. Then we were summoned to awake from sleep. To-day we are reminded that the awakening may be, and ought to be, an awakening to great joy: we are bidden to hope.

St. Paul reminds the Church of Rome that ancient Israel, in the Scriptures she bequeathed to the Church, left in the "things which were written aforetime" a legacy of Hope. The Promise of the Redeemer, traced faintly upon the earliest page of that ancient record, grew more and more clear as the centuries went by. At first dim and doubtful, it became plainer and more plain, until it found its way into all the national life, and penetrated all the national literature, and inspired all the highest and best of the national heroes, prophets, and statesmen. It became the special and characteristic feature of the Hebrew people, that they looked forward for their golden age to come, while other nations looked back upon a golden age that was past. The face of Heathendom was turned backward; that of Israel towards the future. The voice of Heathendom was Retrospect and Regret; that of Israel was Hope. And this remained true so long as the nation was really living and strong. No people ever had a grander past than that of Israel. The Hebrew looked back, with proud and pardonable triumph, to the Exodus, to Sinai, to the crossing of Jordan, to the victories of Joshua and the warrior-judges; to the glories of David and Solomon, the moral splendours of Moses and Elijah, of Samuel and Isaiah. Such a history may well tempt a nation to rest upon it. and to remain contemplating its own past glory, Yet, until Jewish Church and Jewish State alike had lost the spiritual power which was its life, the Hebrew people looked forward and forward ever, untempted by the magnificence of their past. The coming of Messiah, and the redemption of Israel—this was their hope. Hope, then, was the very heart of the chosen people's life. Hope it is which gives to their history its interest, to their poetry its depth, and to their Old Testament its sanctity.

These ancient books, as St. Paul reminds the Romans, were not written and bequeathed for Hebrews alone. The things that were written aforetime, of which the Apostle speaks, were written for our learning no less than for theirs. We bind them in one with our own New Testament, the record of our Lord's life and of His Church's birth; we call both together the Bible, the Book of books,, which we regard with special regard and reverence throughout all Christendom, particularly in this, our English land. So close to us are those ancient Hebrew histories; so significant their teachings; so profound their importance and value for us. Their word to us, my brethren, is Hope. "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we . . . .

through comfort of the Scriptures might have hope."

We shall surely do no violence to the Apostle's words, if we widen them so as to include those other Scriptures, of which he did not think when he wrote this epistle, since few, if any, of the New Testament writings were publicly known, or even existing. But now, to us who read his words, it is impossible to leave them out of sight. For they tell of the fulfilment of Israel's long hope; the crown and climax of her waiting. The hope had often grown dim, and latterly had well nigh died away. The prophetic voices which kept it so long alive and active had sunk into silence; and the nation either ceased to hope, or indulged a hope perverted, distorted, debased. But at last it was fulfilled when God's time had come, and the desire of all nations was born into the world. The New Testament tells us of all this, so that the whole Bible is a record of a nation's hope, and its accomplishment after long waiting in the fulness of time.

But, my Christian brethren, the Bible is more than this. It tells of other nations than the Hebrews, and of another Church than that of Israel, to whose life Hope is as necessary as to them. Hope is the very heart of the Christian Church. The Hebrews waited for His first coming, we for His second. To them the symbolism of their Levitical ritual, the mighty voices of the prophets of the Lord, told of a past which was only memorable because it was pregnant with such a future. To us the Sacraments of the Gospel, the Scriptures of the Church, the services of choir and of altar, tell the same tale. As the Jewish Church hoped and waited, so the Christian Church hopes and waits to-day. And lest she should weary of her watch, and slacken in her service, and fail of her hope, her Great Apostle speaks his word of calm and inspiring confidence to-day, through the Scripture appointed to be read. Israel hoped and waited; the Church hopes and waits. Israel's hope was fulfilled at last, and Israel basely and cruelly rejected it, sealing her own ruin in her rejection. The warning voice of Advent bids us, bids the whole Church, beware and watch, lest she too fail of her hope at the moment when it passes into assured and certain fact.

My brethren, the warning is not needless. The age in which we live is not an age of Hope. Men do not look forward gladly into the future. If they look forward at all, and do not deride Hope as a delusion and a danger which practical men will do well to avoid, they look sadly and hopelessly into the unwritten and the unknown to come, not expecting that it will bring blessing or happiness, but believing that the future will be dark, or even terrible. There is much, no doubt, which leads, or seems to lead, to this pessimistic conclusion. The progress of the world is so slow, the advance of the human race so slight, and the anguish and effort so painful, that there seems little room for hope. The cost of progress appears to be far heavier than the value of its gain.

That is exactly the kind of age in which nations and men are apt to rest upon their past. The outlook is so troubled and clouded that they take refuge in the remembrance of what they have been and have done. They turn their faces backwards, and contemplate their past achievements, until they make the most fatal and irremediable of mistakes, and take memories for hopes. This is what the Pharisees did when they boasted of having Abraham to their father; this was the attitude of the Sadducees, who crucified Christ for fear the Romans should come and take away their place and nation. The Jewish Church, ordained to keep alive the hope of the Jewish people, was thus the very means of its destruction.

My brethren in the Lord, let us ask ourselves if we, as Christians, have been yielding to the same spirit? It is impossible that the atmosphere of hopelessness which surrounds, as it were, the Christian Church to-day, should not, to some extent, affect herself. The most healthy and vigorous man will find it hard to breathe freely in a fog. The air is poisoned, and the Church suffers. Her hope, like that of Israel in her worst days, flickers and wavers like a failing light. If St. Paul's call in to-day's Epistle be heeded, she will remember the fate of Israel, and rouse herself. There, in the record of Scripture to which we are pointed to-day, is the story of the hope and its fulfilment. We can see, as we regard it, how fatal was the mistake, how ruinous its consequences. Can we not see that the same peril is before our own steps? He who loses hope loses life. Israel lost the one through loosing her hold of the other. Are we not in danger of doing the like?

Revive, then, this day your Christian spirit of hope. Rekindle the golden flame of the waiting virgin's lamp; for, believe me, those on whom the doors were closed were those who had ceased to hope for the Bridegroom's coming. The atmosphere of the world without may be heavy, oppressive, and dark; it may depress and crush the soaring spirit, and even quench its hope. But within the Church, if she be but true to herself and to her Master, the air is full of health and energy, because it has Hope. Does the sense of coming disaster, of some imminent calamity, appal and stifle your soul? Remember that the Day of the Lord is to be hoped for and welcomed, no less than to be awaited with solemn awe, since it sweeps evil and darkness away with the whirlwinds of destruction and of judgment. Does the burden of your own past sin weigh down your spirit, and dull the power of onward and upward look? It is often so; the heritage of past wrong-doing is a bitter burden, and makes the continued struggle

sterner and seemingly less effectual than ever But, have hope! The comfort of the Scriptures is yours, and in them you will find the promises of forgiveness, and pardon, and peace through the Lord Jesus Christ. Is that no source of Hope? Have not the sorrowful and downhearted, in all the ages of the Christian world, been comforted and inspired by that blessed hope? Why should it fail you, when it was so surpassingly effectual for them?

Nor is it only for the present that here we may learn to rest, labouring on in unfailing hope. "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men the most miserable"! Hope is the talisman whose possessor gains eagle-sight, to pierce the veil which hangs between this world and the next, and to soar across the frontiers of sense and time. What is amiss here and now, shall be righted there and then. What is dark shall be made light; what is difficult shall become clear, "the crooked straight, and the rough places plain." The vision of heaven, attained through hope, can reconcile men to bear with earth. The Judge of all the earth will assuredly do right, but in His own time and His own way. Meanwhile, it is ours to wait, and work, and hope.

Two means to this happy end are set before us by the Apostle. The first is Patience. It is a difficult virtue at best, and more than ever, in an impatient, hurried age like this. But he who has learned how to wait has mastered a secret of the universe. Not in vain was it said that all things come round to him who waits. Waiting, as we have seen, is not an idle, dreamy state of lethargy and uselessness; it is strenuous and eager, not purposeless and weak. Learn to have patience, then, with God's slow appointed ways with the world and with your soul, and of patience shall Hope be born.

The second means to the winning of hope, as we have seen, in the "comfort of the Scriptures." There was a time when English men and women read and knew the Bible far more than I fear is the case with us to-day. As a consequence, they were more hopeful than we are. No book of devotion, no poetry, no biography, can ever take the place of those Scriptures, written for our learning. No book is so pre-eminently the book of hope. Let us make one resolve here, this second Sunday in Advent, that we will take our Bible down from its dusty shelf again, and once more begin to "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest" its teachings. The day must come to each of us, when we shall have full need of all our resources of comfort, patience, and hope. What happiness, then, to turn to some message of God to the soul, long since read and marked in our own well-loved Bible, and digested and thought out over and over again! What an irreparable loss to have no "comfort of the Scriptures" in that day! Let us take this Advent lesson home, and begin at once to carry it into practice; to discipline the soul for Judgment by a more constant and careful use of the Blessed Book. "Now the God of Hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost."

MAINTENANCE OF VOLUNTARY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

By the Rev. H. ROW, Prebendary of Wells and Rector of Poyntington; and Assistant Diocesan Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of Bath and Wells.

Paper Read at the Manchester Church Congress.

If I had had to open the discussion on the maintenance of voluntary elementary schools ten years ago, I should have had to deal with a balance-sheet of a decidedly depressing character. For at that time, and for many years before, the expenditure in Church schools was annually in excess of the income—that excess averaging about £28,000 a-year, and for the nine years ending with 1878 amounting to $1\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. on the gross income. But Lord Sandon's Act of 1876 came as a welcome boon to all voluntary schools; for whilst for the three years ending with 1876 the average grant to all Church schools did not exceed 12s. a head, in the three years last past that average has run up to 16s. 7½d. a head; the actual increase between 1878 and 1887 being about 3s. 8d. a head, whilst the growth in the expenditure between the same two dates was but 2s. 3d. a head. It is not, therefore, very surprising to find that in the nine years ending with 1887 the excess of the expenditure over the income in all Church schools has barely reached £1,000 a year, as compared with the £28,000 a year in the period immediately preceding 1878—a deficiency of little more than $\frac{1}{30}$ per cent. on the whole income—and any one content with a merely superficial view of the whole question might be disposed to think that, inasmuch as both ends now so nearly meet, and more particularly as volunteer subscribers to Church schools last year had to contribute £22,000 less than in 1878, there is little else to do but just to see that the income at present raised shall in some way or other be invested with the property of a perfect fluid, so that the overplus in one neighbourhood may flow in freely to fill up the deficiency in others. But a closer investigation into the finances of Church schools reveals somewhat of a reverse to this apparently satisfactory state of things. To begin with—school income is not of the nature of a perfect fluid, for whilst in here and there a parish the managers are rich enough to be saving up for a rainy day; in others, it is only by pressing and tugging that the two ends are anyhow brought together, and in not a few parishes there is an adverse balance which is yearly growing, and must by-and-by be as a stone round the victim's neck to sink him in the tide. Then, again, there is a whole class of small schools—rural schools for the most part—of which the Education Commissioners, both the majority and the minority have recently reported that their supporters are much overburdened, and that the schools, which must necessarily be costly, stand in need of further aid. In the

early part of 1887 I tabulated statistics I had collected from 151 small rural schools in Somerset parishes, with populations ranging from 90 to 550; and I laid the results before the Commissioners, before whom I was called to give evidence. These statistics clearly showed that, owing to the relatively great expense of the school staff, the lowness of the school fees, and the impossibility of earning large grants, the burden falling upon the local supporters of those schools, exceeded the average of this item for all Church schools in England by 8s. 4d. a head; and when the special grants received by some of those schools were for statistical purposes supposed to be spread over the whole group, the excess just mentioned was only reduced to 5s. 8d. In other words, taking the whole group of 151 schools, the voluntary subscribers who had made themselves answerable for keeping them up, were, and still are, paying nearly twice as much per scholar as is paid on the average by voluntary contributors for all Church schools. There is still one other matter which is giving uneasiness to voluntary school managers. I said just now that since 1878 the adverse balance in Church schools had been accumulating only at the average rate of about £1,000 a year. But here it will be well to see how this average is actually constituted. In three years ending with 1881 there was an actual surplus of income over expenditure averaging £2,000 a year; and in the year 1883—the year when Mr. Mundella's Code was just beginning to come into operation, but when none of the grants under that code had yet begun to enter into the school balance sheets—there was a surplus of over £11,000. But the new code, which on the whole was a decided improvement on former codes, was soon seen to have this double effect—the grants in five years rapidly rose from a little over 15s. to nearly 17s. a head, the expenditure, however, increasing in a still more rapid degree, with the result that last year the deficiency in the Church schools was over £11,000. To put this another way, Church school managers in 1887 were nearly £23,000 worse off than in 1883—a result I can trace to nothing else but to the additional expensiveness of working a school under the requirements of the last of the codes.

But do the Commissioners give school managers any hope that school expenditure for the future will be less than in the past? A very careful study of this most interesting report has convinced me the very reverse of this is perfectly certain to prove to be the truth.

Elementary education under any scheme based upon the recommendation of the Commissioners—adopt whichever of the two reports you please—will be a much more costly thing in the next decade than it has been in the last. You cannot carry out the much extended syllabus of spiritual subjects unanimously recommended by the whole body of the Commissioners; you cannot provide for the considerable increase to be made in the code staff minimum; you cannot make drawing universal, cookery general, and elementary science a part of the programme of every school; you cannot engage itinerant teachers—put your schools in the hands of organising masters; buy more reading books; found school libraries, and withal give a general lift-up to the character and quality of the school-accommodation, furniture and apparatus—you cannot need all these varied and very expensive new requirements (with every one of which I am heartily in accord) without incurring a greatly increased expenditure, in comparison with which the increase occasioned by Mr. Mundella's code just referred to will be but a flea-bite. It is clear, therefore, that voluntary school managers as a body, and the managers of certain classes schools in particular, are rapidly moving on towards a crisis. The schools, with accumulating debts and with threatened added burdens must, if left alone, go under. Small schools, if they cannot get better terms, will find their at present much over-burdened supporters distinctly decline to have another ounce heaped upon their shoulders. And voluntary schools in general will begin to raise a great outcry the moment they are required to show better and more varied results as a condition of having a share in the parliamentary grant.

What then are the remedies to be applied to meet the difficulties I have been endeavouring to set forth?

In the first place to meet the case of one school starving and dying by inches, whilst perchance the school in the next parish has a comfortable and growing balance to keep its managers in good heart, I am disposed to recommend a modified communistic remedy. I do not say that I would lay violent hands on the rich school balance and cast it straight into the empty purse of its neighbour; but I would try to make the manager of the rich school remember that they and their indigent neighbours are all members of the same great Church—all engaged in the same good work, and all aiming at the same great end; and I would further have them think that it is absolutely impossible for one member of the body to suffer without all the other members suffering with it. Of course the practical outcome of my advice would be the creation everywhere of voluntary association of isolated bodies of school managers, each of which associations would take under its wing all the Church schools in its district, with a view of strengthening the finances of the weaker schools by grants from a common sustentation fund, improving the economy of the management, supplying itinerant teachers for special subjects so as to increase the grant earned, and otherwise varying the character and quality of the work done in the whole group of schools associated together. Such an association has had a most vigorous start at Huddersfield; and some of the results already attained are almost startling. Certain of the Church schools in the town and neighbourhood hold aloof from the association; but some 122 departments in all are affiliated to it. In these 122 departments in the six years since the association was formed there has been a marked improvement in the actual quality of the school accommodation, the staff has been strengthened, the average attendance has been augmented by 10 per cent., and the grant has increased nearly 3s. a head all round—the increase in the grant of the non-affiliated schools being less than 1s. a head. If similar associations were spread as a network all over the land, the limit of area being one or two or more rural deaneries, and if they were everywhere worked as in Huddersfield, in Bradford, in Liverpool, and in a rapidly growing lot of other places, we should hear but little of thoroughly inefficient Church schools, and still less of Church schools succumbing to the School Board.

To meet the case of small rural schools something more than association of the managers is needed to keep their heads above water. It is not much use for twenty people to club their purses together if all of them are empty. The Commissioners, both majority and minority, are quite awake to this fact;

and they are all agreed that there is only one fair way in which at one and the same time you can afford relief to the present heavily burdened shoulders of the subscribers and improve the staff and general condition of the schools themselves. The present special grants of £10 in parishes under 300 people, and of £15 in parishes under 200 must be increased, extended in their application, and so graduated that there shall be a steady increase of the grant coincident with the decrease in the average attendance. And all this is strongly and unanimously recommended by the Commissioners whose proposition it is that the following rule shall be used for calculating the amount of the special grant in each individual case: From 100 take the average attendance of the school and for each unit of the remainder reckon 6s. 8d. to the grant. When, therefore, the average attendance is 40, since 40 from 100 leaves 60, the special grant will be 60 times 6s. 8d. or £20 in all. It is a blot in this recommendation that, however much the school attendance falls below 40, the special grant is not to exceed £20, although Mr. Cumin in his evidence recommended a maximum of £25. The managers of the smallest of these small schools also will have to watch the terms in the clause in any Education Bill which shall be framed for carrying out this proposal, so as to make sure that the new special grant shall be given to the one small school in each separate school district as well as to all the schools below 100 in average attendance which are two miles apart from the nearest available school or from each other.

Lastly, we have to consider what is to be done to make the school income of the future able to bear the additional burdens which almost any legislation upon the basis of the Commissioners' report is certain to throw upon the supporters of voluntary schools. One of the first things to agitate for is the total abolition of the 17s. 6d. limit. In 1876, when Lord Sandon was piloting his Education Bill through Parliament, the ground upon which he urged the raising of the old 15s. limit to 17s. 6d. was that the average cost of elementary education which had formerly stood at 30s. a head had gone up to 35s.—the half of which, therefore, namely, 17s. 6d., ought in his opinion to be provided by Government. And up to this limit the Education Act of 1876 repealed all the other conditions of the grant; namely, its not being allowed to exceed the locally raised income or the half of the gross expenditure of the school. Well, since 1876 the average cost of education has taken another leap, and is now close upon 40s. a head. If, therefore, there is any reason at all for fixing a limit of grant, that reason demands that the 17s. 6d. limit of 1876 should be superseded by a 20s. limit in 1889. It is most reassuring to read among the recommendations of the majority one proposing the entire abolition of the 17s. 6d. limit, and another setting forth a scale of proposed grants which shall average for all schools 20s. a head. And although the minority have not seen their way to the adoption of the exact views of the majority in this particular, they not only claim that more public money should be spent upon improving elementary education, but upon this special question their final conclusion is little more than a mild protest against the bolder proposals of the majority:—"We are of opinion," they say, "that whatever may be the fate of the 17s. 6d. limit we are in all cases entitled to expect a substantial amount of local contribution as a condition of state assistance."

But the majority make another proposal in aid of voluntary schools—a proposal which I take leave to say would if adopted drive the last nail into the coffin of the voluntary school system. They propose that up to a certain limit voluntary school managers for every shilling they voluntarily subscribe shall take another shilling from the local rates. Some of the results of adopting such a plan are manifest. People are not going to pay both subscriptions and rates—that is the cry of those who demand this concession. On their own showing, therefore, the result of demanding more in rates will be a diminution in the subscription list. Taxation without representation will never again be tolerated in this country; voluntary managers, therefore, who claim help from the rates must be prepared to admit ratepayers' representatives to the committee of management. And wherein will this state of things essentially differ from universal school boards? Churchmen are not going to be Esaus and sell their birthright for such a miserable mess of pottage as this is. Besides, the levy of three-quarters of a million of additional rates to meet the like amount of voluntary contributions will make national education intensely unpopular among the ratepayers, and especially so in rural districts.

The opponents of the voluntary system in advocating free education have shown themselves much wiser in their generation. They boldly declare that the extra money to compensate for the loss of fees must come not from the ratepayers' pockets—they would not dare to propose such a scheme—but from the much less restive milch cow of the Imperial Revenue. Even our Jewish friends set us a far nobler example in this particular. A Jew from religious scruples cannot enter a workhouse and partake of its ordinary fare. So they have formed a special board of relief to deal with such cases, a Jew uncomplainingly paying the ordinary poor-rate demanded of him and in addition rating himself for the support of his pauper brethren. Small churchmen do less than this in the endeavour to teach the children belonging to them the truths which are so dear and so comforting to themselves? Church congregations are induced to give by way of offertory very large sums for the support of a hearty musical service in their church; surely it ought not to be difficult to show them how solemn is the duty resting on them to contribute with equal liberality towards the religious education of the young.

But I further contend that the demand now contested is useless as well as dangerous, and utterly wrong in principle. Take the case of Bradford, where the voluntary contributions last year were less than 2s. a head in average attendance at voluntary schools. Remove the present limit and secure that the average grant shall be 20s., and the increase of income obtained in this way will more than equal the 2s it would be possible under the proposed change in the law to levy by way of rates. Let us do all we can to support the policy of doing away with the 17s. 6d. limit and of raising the average grant to 20s.—and especially the recommendation to make the future fixed grant 10s. a head instead of 4s. 6d. as at present—but let us keep clear of any attempt to put our hands into the ratepayers' pockets. Rather let us in a spirit of true self denial dip our hands a little deeper into our own for the sake of Christ's little ones and of our holy faith.

On the question of *Fee versus Free*, little need be said when it is known that only one Commissioner of the whole 23 dared distinctly to propose the abolition of fees.

And lastly, on the question whether the education given in elementary schools should be religious, I have only the time to echo the words of the majority of the Commissioners, "It is much to be hoped that the religious and moral training in all elementary schools may be raised to the high standard which has already been reached in many of them;" and to further say that the worst method of aiding to bring this about would be that which compels a School Board, willing or not willing: toprovide religious instruction in their school.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

The Epiphany.

To us, who have enjoyed all the privileges of the Christian dispensation; to us, who have become so familiar with the sublime truths which Christianity includes, the birth, life, death, and resurrection of our Saviour. The expectant attitude of the world at the time of the Epiphany seems almost incredible. We have known of Christ so long, that we fail to realise that there *was* a time when He was yet in heaven, when He yet was the expected one, the longed-for Deliverer. We have too often looked upon the Magi as mere figures in advance in which we take little interest. We forget that they were living souls whose minds watched intently for the sign of the coming one—the great Healer and Restorer, the King. Do we not also need to plead guilty to ingratitude? Are we sufficiently thankful for all that the Epiphany, this Manifestation of Jesus to the Gentiles, means to us, who are ourselves Gentiles? If we try and picture to ourselves for one moment what life *and* death would be to us, were there for us no Christ, we must surely feel how remiss we have been in the past. Much as we should be in advance of the Magi, can we not learn a lesson from their attention to the smallest indication of God's leading hand? A star only was their guide. Does not God still lead His people by what seem sometimes but very trivial things? Some chance word, some slight difference in the making of a day's plans, some sentence in a book, even occurrences as simple as these, have often changed a whole life career. Let us then learn to watch for the slightest intimation of God's will; those who wait upon Him shall never fail to be guided aright. And just as this new year is beginning, and we all want it to be a success, this will be a useful and helpful thought, that through all its griefs and sorrows, all its difficulties and disappointments, God will lead us safely if we ask Him. Then we may learn another lesson from their faithful following of God's star. Where would have been the use of the sign if they had passed it by as too insignificant to be worth their notice? They would never have seen the Christ had they not obeyed. And so it is with us. We often lose much comfort, much time and strength; we suffer where we might have rejoiced, because we we do not accept in simple *faith* God's guidance. We have had centuries of instruction and light, shall we do worse than the Magi? By faith we should know our God well; may we endeavour to profit by our knowledge, so to live our life here, that when we shall be called to the hereafter, we may rise joyfully to obey the summons, knowing that we shall "after this life have the fruition of His glorious Godhead."

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly
CURED
by simply using the
AMMONIAPHONE
FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.
21s. post free.
WILL LAST FOR YEARS.
Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials may be had FREE OF CHARGE on application to Medical Battery Co. Ltd.
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 5, 1889.

CONCERNING CHURCHWARDENS.

Churchwardens' duty is "not confined to the care of the ecclesiastical property of the parish over which they are chosen to exercise a discretionary power for specific purposes. In all other respects it is an office of *observation* and *complaint*, but not of *control*, with respect to divine worship. They must provide all requisites, the furniture which is specified, the bread and wine, the surplice and books, for performance of divine service, as directed by law. The minister has the use of them. If he errs in this there arises a just matter of complaint, which the churchwardens are bound to attend to, but the law would not oblige them to complain if they had power in themselves to redress." So almost verbatim Lord Stowell in a great decision lays down the law. It may be an interesting historical question how the churchwardens are nominated, also what is requisite for the legal action of this branch of Church officials. But under the provisions of the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, one being sufficient for complaint in reference to the conduct of the divine service by the clergyman. We pass over this question for more serious considerations. Now, what may it be in the divine service "of which complaint may be, must, indeed, be made"? Strange preachers may be refused until their letters of orders are produced. Also, "if the minister introduces any irregularity into the service they have no authority to interfere (though properly interposing, but without violence, in the case of indecent

interruptions or the like), but they may *complain to the ordinary*." Now, further, the actual specialities connected with the divine service, thus legally laid down as restrainable by complaint, are again particularly defined in the above Act. These are (1) The fabric, furniture, ornaments and decorations of the church. (2) The dress of the minister. (3) The observance of the rubrics in the performance of the divine service. And the archdeacon, churchwarden, or any three parishioners may complain. Now, of course, in reference to some rubrics there may be difficulties as to how to observe them. But there are others which have been decided in the highest law courts again and again. So there is no question of law breaking in ignorance, or any doubt of duty here.

For example, of such glaring illegalities take, say, eucharistic vestments, lights, not for light on the Holy Table, but for symbolism, incense, mixed cup, pictures on the walls, and solitary communion. All these a churchwarden is bound to complain of, and to "wait the remedy of a proper legal complaint." Suppose, again, that all these were complained of by not one, but the two churchwardens, over and over again to the bishop; suppose again this was done in a respectful, careful and deferential manner, due regard being paid to every minute requirement in the manner of legally and formally preferring the complaint, in respect of acts, dates, evidence and so forth. And suppose yet again, by a stretch of the imagination to the verge of credulity, that after all this being done, no redress is afforded, and no item of the misconduct is given up, but the illegalities proceed as if they were legalities—what is to be said, what thought, what must be done? None will surely blame if we take a general outlook of the political and religious situation where "such things be"; there is often an epidemic, an "east wind" abroad that sets every one astray. For example, Mr. Dillon, M.P., spoke in the Imperial Parliament of the law of the land thus: "The detestable poison of unfairness and partiality permeated the law from its highest point down to the lowest police magistrate throughout the whole of Ireland." Oh, now, some one will exclaim, what has this outrageous Hibernian illegality to do with the case in question? Much, in every way, we reply; and, climax though it be of outspoken defiance, we must cap this climax from the explanation of a recent "declaration," issued for signature by an English archdeacon. He puts the matter in the following neat antithesis: "The time is come for the recovery of the true discipline, viz., spiritual causes by spiritual judges, a discipline which can alone commend and command a loyal obedience." That is to say, quite like Land League jurors to try landlords' cases, and a local parliament to make laws for Irish loyalists. That this is here precisely such, we clear up fully and easily.

The rector of the parish concerned writes thus, as we read in the public press: "My contention is that not only the decisions of the Privy Council are illegal, but that the Court itself is an illegally constituted one. . . . . I admit that the decisions are binding, if the Bishop choose to enforce them, and that I am entirely in his lordship's hands," etc. What now of the Bishop? He would examine and act on the churchwardens' complaints, or do neither. If the churchwardens acted informally, they ousted themselves. If their complaint, though formally correct, was of frivolous matter, preferred in a captious and contentious spirit, he might take a high tone of disregard. And small blame to him for this. But if the case was not such, but the exact opposite, being as above, his lordship might *veto* the complaint, and register "his reasons." But if he did no such thing, here again, what is to be said? If this is what can be done in the way of a masterly inactivity under The Public Worship Regulation Act, then it is a Public Worship Revolution Act. And it places bishops in a false position, unless also they do the very same themselves, in countenance of an extensive conspiracy to turn the Reformed Church of England into what is the same as a Roman Catholic Church. But surely there must be some remedy for such an attempt to make the law contemptible, and to turn what is illegal into what is legal through the law itself. If all churchwardens over the whole of England would but do their "duty of observation and complaint" in such cases the evil would become so glaring as to work out its own cure through the universality of the scandal. But churchwardens must be extremely cautious, as well as bold and honest. They must never compromise themselves, or spoil a good cause by bad management. There is no great difficulty or complexity, however, as to what their course is. If they follow "The Churchwardens' Guide," [Tenth edition. By W. G. Brooke. London: Knight and Co.; 90, Fleet-street,] they can have no difficulty in knowing exactly what to do with ecclesiastical jokers having bishops at their backs. But whether or not such course be generally taken, the anomaly is so monstrous and the evils of such magnitude that, for the sake of the Church, and even bishops themselves, their lordships must no longer be in a position to pose as "Lords of Misrule."

In the above, the question of what the churchwardens ought to do, where "reasons" are registered that are not reasonable (because "what is not reason is not law"), was not discussed. On this we only suggest that the churchwardens of the Church of England, by forming a "Churchwardens' Defence Association," with a small annual contribution from each one, may find themselves well able to make their just complaints with good effect, and save the laity from an insidious movement, also repel from the Church what it expelled at the Reformation.

THE PRACTICAL OBSERVANCE AND MORAL OBLIGATION OF THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

Notes Contributed to a Clerical Symposium by the Rev. Brownlow Maitland.

The questions raised by our subject appear to be these. Is the Fourth Commandment *per se* still binding, and a divine law for Christians? If not, does it rest on some moral principle which is of perpetual obligation? What is the connection between the Lord's Day and the Fourth Commandment? What are the principles which ought to govern our observance of the Lord's Day? These four questions I propose to take in order.

1. The first is included in the larger question—Is the Decalogue *per se*, as a code of law, binding on Christians? It is no answer to say that a great deal in the Decalogue is binding; because it may be so for other reasons, and not because it is in the Decalogue. The criminal code of a foreign state does not bind Englishmen, although much that is in it may be contained in English law, and be binding on that account. The question is, can the Decalogue, simply as such, be rightly regarded as imposed upon Christians? What is the Decalogue? We have two versions of it, both asserted with equal emphasis to have been, word for word, spoken by the voice and written by the finger of God. The differences between them are in parts which appear to be expansions of the brief initial sentences or precepts; and when to this fact is added another, that in each case the Decalogue is said to consist of ten words, it seems probable that prior to both versions of it was one which consisted of so many short, pithy laws, without any expansion or detail. Thus the earlier form of the fourth commandment might have been simply this—"Remember [or observe], the Sabbath day to keep it holy."

But how came about the two expanded and inconsistent versions, claiming equal authority?

The answer must be found in a critical examination of the growth and structure of the Old Testament. On the hypothesis of the exclusive Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, as a literary work, the phenomenon is inexplicable; but it is easily accounted for by the modern critical view of the amalgamation in the Old Testament of several distinct and successive cycles of literary composition, all of which are represented in the Pentateuch, and which are commonly distinguished in their chronological order as the Jehovist, the Deuteronomic, and the Priestly codes. Viewed in the light of this analysis, the two longer forms of the Decalogue will appear to be differing developments of some simpler original, itself perhaps of gradual growth, and we are led on to the conclusion that the Decalogue, as we have it, was a gradual result of that progressive Divine revelation and training by which the Hebrew religion was slowly evolved, and marks what may be called the culminating point which Hebrew Ethics had attained in the middle or later prophetical age. If so, then it is essentially a document of the older dispensation, part and parcel of Hebraism; not in itself of perpetual or universal obligation as if it were the perfect and ultimate expression of the Eternal moral law; yet highly convenient and valuable for us as a summary of duty, if only in using it we bear in mind that no precept in it binds us because it is there, and that for us the Decalogue has to be corrected, interpreted, supplemented by that which alone has divine and absolute authority over us—the revelation, the law, of our Master, Christ.

2. As to the question whether the fourth commandment rests upon some moral principle of perpetual obligation for all men, it seems to be of inferior importance, as far as our subject is concerned. What the commandment enjoins is rest, not worship; so that the duty of worshipping God cannot be its principle. Nor is it easy to imagine that the tying down of the enjoined rest to one day in every seven, still less to a particular day, has anything intrinsically moral in it. No argument to the contrary can be founded on the use of the words *holy*, *hallowed*, or *sanctified*, because primarily they did not connote moral or spiritual ideas, but only separation for God. The purport of the fourth commandment is that God gave Israel six days of the week for the doing of their own work, the seventh He reserved for Himself. This reservation of it, acknowledged by the compulsory rest, constituted its sanctification, its holiness. What moral principle underlies the command, must be sought in another direction. Primarily it is a law of social duty, having for its object to provide a periodical rest for the children of toil, and to shield them from the burden of unremitting labour. Its root-principle may therefore be found in that duty of consideration for others, which underlies all the commandments summed up in the precept—"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

3. From the foregoing considerations it may be reasonably inferred that the Sabbath law of Israel is not in any way binding on Christians, and is not the basis on which the Lord's Day rests. Our sacred day rests on a fact and an authority which are purely Christian. The fact is Christ's resurrection; the authority is the universal practice of the Church from the Apostolic age. It is part and parcel of historical Christianity, and if any one were to propose to change so much as its period to any other number of days, the reply would be sufficient—"We have no such custom, neither the Churches of God." Yet the existence of the Jewish Sabbath, with its later tradition of synagogue worship, must have largely helped to mould the form which the Christian commemoration of the Lord's resurrection assumed. For in that weekly festival of Israel, with its rest and worship, there was ready to hand a pattern with which the first Christians were thoroughly familiar, and of which they had felt the value. How natural, then, for them to glide into keeping a similar weekly religious festival of their own, a festival of rest and worship, of gladness and thanksgiving, which would both nourish their own spiritual life in Christ, and testify for Him to the world.

4. As to the mode of keeping the Lord's Day, Christians appear to be under no precise law of divine obligation. The fourth commandment has passed away with Judaism in general, and Christ has put nothing in its place. But as His Church has always consecrated the day in a special manner to joint worship and communion in religious ordinances, that use of it is authoritatively binding on us as part of the framework of visible Christianity. Beyond that, all else is a matter of spiritual expediency. And spiritual expediency is no hard and fast rule. It varies with circumstances: it is different for different ages, for different classes in the same age. It is not the same for adults and for children, for cultured Christians and for the uneducated or toiling masses, for the European and for the Hindoo and the Negro. Each of us should

put his own standard of observance high, without trying to force it upon others. Compulsory legislation about Sunday observance ought not to go beyond what is necessary for the protection of those who live by toil. Our aim should be to make the day an effectual antidote to the deadening influence of the world of sense on our sensibility to spiritual things, and for that purpose it is desirable to keep up a very marked difference between it and common days, that it may be a standing witness to us of the reality of that spiritual world in which our inmost self lives. Freedom, spirituality, charity—those three great principles of the Christian life—should be the regulating principles of our Lord's Day observance.

IRELAND SINCE THE UNION.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D., Warrenpoint. Author of "Ireland since the Reformation," "The Church of St. Patrick," "The Geraldines," etc.

(*Continued from page* 310.)

CHAPTER XVIII.—(*continued*).

On May 5th the assassins watched for Mr. Burke, and again on the 6th. Carey took the precaution of bringing with him a man named Smith to identify the Under-Secretary. They took up a position—on one of the benches in the Phœnix Park—commanding a view of the avenue: "At seven o'clock Smith suddenly started from his seat and advanced a few paces in a diagonal direction towards the road, exclaiming, 'Who is this? Here he is.' Kavanagh's car was in waiting to convey Carey and Smith to the rendezvous nearly opposite the Viceregal Lodge, and as they approached Carey gave the pre-concerted signal with his handkerchief. At the spot where the deed was to be done were Brady, Kelly, Pat Delaney, Caffrey, Fagan, and Joseph Hanlon, with Fitzharris, and his cab in waiting. Carey having pointed out to Brady that it was the tall gentleman in the grey suit, asked what was to be done with Smith? 'Tell him to get out of that;' was the reply. Carey conveyed the message to Smith, who at once made for the Island Bridge Gate. Brady then intimated to Carey that he too might go, and he therefore followed Smith.

"The unsuspecting victims were about two hundred and fifty yards from the assassins, who had meanwhile split into three groups to take their places on the path. The first group consisted of Curley, Fagan and Hanlon—three men whom no one would for a moment suspect of such a crime as murder. Twelve feet from them were Brady and Kelly, while six feet further along the path were Delaney and Caffrey. Carey looked at his watch, almost at the moment when he looked back, and saw the two gentlemen pass near the three assassins. It was exactly seventeen minutes past seven. He saw them also pass the second two without any action being taken, and he thought—— but he did not finish the sentence. A moment afterwards Brady and Kelly executed a right-about movement, and closed with their victims. Carey saw Brady strike Mr. Burke with his left hand, and that was all he waited to see. He made rapidly for Island Bridge Gate, and there overtook Smith. With him he appeared in several places where he was known, for the purpose of letting himself be seen. That evening he met Curley, who gave him his version of the murders. Later on Carey met Brady, who gave him the following account of his share in the ghastly deed: 'I put my hand upon Mr. Burke's left shoulder and stabbed him. While doing so the other gentleman struck me in the face with an umbrella, and said, "Oh, you ruffian!" With that I got annoyed and excited, and I followed him, and he put up his arm, and I struck him on the arm. He went out on the road, and I settled him there. I looked and I saw Tim Kelly at Mr. Burke. He was at him, and coming away from him, and *I went back myself and cut Mr. Burke's throat.*'"

Carey detailed the proceedings of the murder gang with horrible frankness:—

"The number of choice spirits who were to be enrolled, under the name of the Irish Invincibles, was to be limited to two hundred, or to two hundred and fifty. They were to be all picked men of the Fenian organisation. The Dublin contingent was to be limited to fifty members, and Carey, James Mullett, Edward McCaffery, and Daniel Curley, were to be responsible for them. The object of the Invincibles was the removal of all tyrants from the country, the constituted administrators and guardians of law and order, and owners of property, being the principal persons included in this category.

"The first persons selected for removal were Mr Forster (against whose life, happily, several unsuccessful attempts were made), and Earl Cowper. Mr. Forster had some very marvellous escapes. It would seem that tyrants of the first-class were to be the objects of joint action, but apart from their removal each assassin was to be allowed 'his own discretion to choose the remainder.' Fifty sovereigns was the first blood-money paid over to Carey. Mr. Burke's name was next placed on the list for removal. To compass Earl Cowper's death Carey went about a house in Cork Hill. Visits were paid to Phœnix Park to identify Mr. Forster and Mr. Burke.

"About this time Carey made the acquaintance of *R. J. Sheridan* (the agent mentioned in the Kilmainham treaty), who was in the disguise of a priest, and went by the name of the Rev. Father Murphy. *He was the travelling organiser of the Invincibles, and promised Carey to send arms from England.* He said that arrangements were being made for men like Clifford Lloyd, and gave Carey twenty sovereigns, and on another occasion fifteen sovereigns. It was suggested that rifles should be sent from England, but Carey suggested knives as being more suitable for their purpose, subsequently a rifle, two revolvers, and a dozen knives were supplied. After this the mysterious personage who was known only as "No. 1," supplied with money, and had conferences with the leaders. Mr. Forster was placed at the head of the list for removal, and on Friday, March 3rd, 1882, arrangements were made for carrying out the sentence. The newspapers were studied as to the Right Hon. gentleman's movements, and telegrams were even sent from London as to his whereabouts. Knives were distributed, and also rifles to be in readiness to finish off Mr. Foster and any friends who might be with him on his arrival by the mail train. But Mr. Foster did not come, and the would-be assassins went away disappointed at being cheated of their prey."

Such were the principal details of that nefarious conspiracy whose attempt to make history culminated in the Phœnix Park assassination.

The Premier, undaunted by the odium excited by the crime, proceeded to carry out his conciliatory policy. Concession was, however, supplemented by the most stringent Coercion Act passed for Ireland during the century. Having thus justified the wisdom of Mr. Foster's advice, Mr. Gladstone introduced an Arrears' Bill to enable tenants under a certain valuation to draw money from the Church Surplus and the Consolidated Fund to wipe out the arrears of rent due to the landlord.

The Coercion Act was aimed at the suppression of secret societies—intimidation, outrages, and the whole system of terrorism which had ruled the country during several years. But the lawless classes had got a-head of authority, and would not be put down without a bitter struggle. Into the minute details of that struggle we need not enter.

In 1883 the Dublin police swooped down upon the Irish Invincibles. James Carey turned informer. This man had planned the crime, elaborated the whole system, organised the conspiracy. He now turned on the miserable dupes whom he had led into the trap—explained the whole plot—identified his associates, and revealed the hideous mechanism of crime and blood by which the Invincibles hoped to make the Island of Saints an independent nation.

Mr. Justice O'Brien presided at the trials. Five of the assassins were found guilty of murder and hanged; others—found guilty of conspiracy to murder—were sentenced to various terms of penal servitude. But the tragedy was not yet complete. Carey had earned the hate of the Irreconcilables by revealing their secrets. He was, in truth, a detestable wretch, but, in turning informer, he only did what others of the gang offered to do. The revolutionary press hounded him down; Government sent him out of the country under an assumed name, but he could not escape. He was shot at sea—between Natal and the Cape—by an Irish American, named O'Donnell. The criminal was brought to London, tried, found guilty, and executed. The Phœnix Park atrocity had cost nine lives, meantime the Land League, suppressed by proclamation, had assumed another name; and, as the National League, started a new agitation.

CHAPTER XIX.

The Church of Ireland: A Model Irish Layman—Sir Joseph Napier.

When the Church of Ireland was visited with the crushing blow of Disestablishment, it was fondly hoped by her enemies that the shock would prove ruinous to her best interests; but time has shown that the chastisement has had the effect of welding into compact force the affectionate zeal alike of clergy and laity. It has given—especially to the laity—an opportunity of proving their devotion to their Church, which they had not been slow to utilise. We ought not, however, to forget that in the years preceding Disestablishment there were many lay members of our communion who loved the Church of St. Patrick with an intelligent and an appreciative affection, and as a specimen of that class we know no name more worthy to be had in remembrance than that of Sir Joseph Napier.

Joseph Napier was born December 26th, 1804. He was the youngest son of William Napier, a Belfast merchant, and a descendant of the Napiers of Merchistoun—a decided Protestant—Napier was nevertheless a true Churchman, "and had little in common with the jealousies and differences of Dissent." He entered Trinity College, Dublin, in 1820; was called to the Irish bar in 1831, and in 1843 stepped into the foremost rank of forensic pleaders by his defence of the notorious Sam Gray, of Ballibay, in the county Monaghan.

In 1847 he was returned as a representative of the University of Dublin in the imperial Parliament, on which occasion he sketched in a few words the outline of his future career: "My humble exertions shall always be devoted with anxious diligence to the good of the Church, the honour of the University, and the welfare of my native country."

Our concern with Napier is as a Churchman, yet we cannot do justice to his immense services to the cause of religion without being deeply impressed by the fact that those services sprang from a heart permeated by the love of God. Surely no sublimer testimony to the value of personal religion has ever been borne than the words of this man who, consecrated to God his rare abilities and in his many avocations, and in high office as Lord Chancellor of Ireland, found time to cultivate "justice, learning, and religion."

"I have served," he said, "a very gracious Master. He has brought me to great honour, and He has comforted me on every side. I have reached the highest point to which my ambition could have aspired, far beyond what I ever contemplated. I have had the calm of leisure and reflection; I have had my day of science; I still relish the refreshment of literature, but let me bear the humble testimony that, after all, there is only one thing worth living for, and that is *to love and serve the Lord Jesus*."

From the outset of his public life Napier deliberately took up the position of a champion of the Established Church, and in that cause his zeal never flagged, and his interest never cooled. We shall now quote some of his utterances, merely remarking that the book we quote from is full of information on the Irish questions.*

As early as 1848, speaking at the National Club, Lord Napier said:—"The Protestantism of Ireland, I tell you, is worth contending for; the Protestant Clergy of Ireland are worthy of your support and sympathy; the Protestant yeomanry of Ireland are as fine a race of men as ever peopled any country in the world. They are men of independent minds; they are men of intelligeuce; they are men of integrity; they are loyal men. . . . . When comparisons are sometimes mentioned Protestants are spoken of as bigoted and extravagant, and the question is asked, What do they want? We want protection to our Church—equality of general privileges; which our religion, our loyalty, our integrity, our principles, and the Treaty of Union, all entitle us to demand."

One of the most remarkable features in the character of Napier was the manner in which he maintained his religious opinions. No matter how mundane the assembly might be which he was called upon to address, he never lost sight of the claims of religion. He never was "ashamed of the Scriptural opinions he upheld, and of expressing how firmly it was his desire to build up his political faith not in strict accordance with party tenets, but solely as it rested upon the basis of revealed truth."

Napier loved the Church of Ireland with an intense

* "Life of Sir Joseph Napier," by Alex. Charles Ewald, F.S.A. London: Longman, Green. 1887.

affection that manifested itself during every period of his busy public career.

Speaking in 1849 against the motion of Bernal Osborne, for the reduction of the Irish Church, Napier said: "I assert that the Established Church is identified with the earliest Church of Ireland, of which it preserves the purity of doctrine and discipline. Have they altered the discipline? Their bishops are the successors of the early bishops of the Church. Whether in doctrine or discipline I am willing to put the matter to the test. I am ready to try its doctrines by the word of God, and prove its regular succession." . . . "In Ireland at least there is not any personal charge which any man is compelled to pay to support the United Church. It was candidly admitted by the hon. and gallant member (Osborne) that the exertions and conduct of the clergy of our Church had been most exemplary and useful. I believe there is not to be found a more faithful body of earnest and devoted men." . . . "The Church, which upholds the of faith eighteen hundred years, and challenges a free appeal to the pure word of God, has a title to be honourably sustained."

The reporters being then as now very often Irish Romanists were not slow to use their influence to damage Napier, and he complains in writing to his wife how they suppressed the signs of approval—clipped the sentences and tried to weaken the force of his arguments.

When Mr. Dillwyn brought forward in 1863 a motion hostile to the Irish Church, Napier wrote to Disraeli urging him to lead the defence of the Church. He said, "But the Irish Church is so bound up with the settlement of property here and with the union of the countries, that I think it is not open to spoliate it in any way that may not affect England and the English Church." . . . . "About one-third of the benefices are under £200 a year, many not worth more than £100 to £150. So that it is plain there is no question for spoliating us if a Church is to be maintained at all." This attack on the Church fell through, but it must have been painfully apparent to a man of Napier's keen penetration that the party opposed to the Church would lose no opportunity of repeating the attack. Speaking before the Dublin Young Men's Christian Association in 1866, he said "our ancient Church existed for several centuries before the English invasion and the Papal intrusion, and those politicians in England who have recently been looking out for a programme for their party and propose to free Ireland from the Church as a 'badge of conquest,' have by a curious infelicity proscribed the only institution that is emphatically our own. It was the gift of the King of kings. We have it by divine right." . . . . Edmund Burke looked to the Church in Ireland "as a great link towards holding fast the connection of religion with the State and preserving the connection of England and Ireland."

In 1867 Napier was created a baronet, and when he took the chair at the annual meeting of the National Club, on the occasion of his first public appearance, after his acceptance of the title, he once more adopted the position of champion of the Church. "The toast I have now to propose is the 'United Church of England and Ireland.' The two branches of it have many things in common, but I must also say that each has its own peculiarity, and each has an historical as well as Scriptural title."

It is melancholy—but it ought to be instructive—to statesmen to observe how all the prophecies of Napier and his friends, as to the results which would follow the overthrow of the Establishment have been fulfilled almost to the very letter. He clearly foresaw that the Irish policy of Gladstone would be regarded as the result of terror, and in 1852 he thus painted the aspirations of Irish patriotism: "The grand aim and object is the breaking down of English rule, and the complete separation of Ireland from England."

When the Church was actually disendowed Sir Joseph Napier took an active part in the work of reconstruction. In 1874-6 he was a member of the Representative Body; in 1876 he received the unanimous thanks of the General Synod for his services as Assessor. He was a liberal subscriber to the funds of the Church. He died, honoured and beloved, Dec. 9, 1882.

Reviews and Notices.

"Christianity According to Christ." J. Monro Gibson, D.D. Nisbet's Theological Library. London: Nisbet & Co.

If only for the exposition of the Lord's Prayer in the opening chapter this book would be worth reading. The exegesis is new and instructive; but there is a mine of wealth in the argument which follows. The author breaks away from the current practice of looking at the Revelation and the book; he refers us to the Revealer Himself—to Jehovah in the Old Testament, to Jesus in the New. He says, it is not "Behold the Book," but "Behold the Man." The Scriptures are but the record of the revelation He has made of Himself.

Those whose faith is unsettled by the questions of science, or of Biblical criticism, are to be told to look unto Jesus. Seeing that superhuman character it is not hard to realise that miracles were wrought by Him, and thence that proofs of His special interposition run through the world's history. Ever busying about low forms of existence, we may infer that life is a play of forces; but when we think of *The Man* we see the animal merged into the spiritual. God is known under human form, though it is His *face*, not absolute essence, which is beheld in Christ.

Subsequent chapters treat of the Trinity as taught by the Lord; of the questions of wisdom personified, and of the Incarnate word. The influence of the spirit, as shown in elementary emblems, then comes before us, these illustrated by the scientific processes now known to us. Passing to the Spirit of the Age, and the difficulties it presents, we are reminded that we have received not the Spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God. There is a steady current among all the eddies of time that sets heavenward. The Psalms of David or of Korah are to us as fresh as if written yesterday.

Dr. Gibson deals with current phrases and theories. The altruism of Christ is not every man for his neighbour, as Mr. Spencer would have us believe; it is full surrender to God. The Church's duty is to study with all effort to secure that which we constantly ask—Thy Will be done.

This means, says Dr. Gibson, that God may reign over the entire earth now, and that all hearts may worship and serve Him. He bids us not to postpone expectations of this till another world is entered upon, but to seek for it in the present.

With the subject of Mission, and our Lord's direc-

tions for carrying them out, this most instructive book concludes.

Churchmen will wish that the author had given more prominence to the work of all the Persons of the Trinity, and they will allow for the fact that he is addressing them of other Communions.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE PROPOSED *EIRENIKON.*

SIR,—The inattention with which the Bishop of Liverpool's proposal, which your correspondent, Canon Crosthwaite, calls an *Eirenikon* has met with, is not surprising, I should suppose, to most persons. The proposal is most invertebrate in character in a practical thing, and it comes from a quarter, which for obvious reasons is not likely to command much attention. Mr. Crosthwaite seems to think that there is a general conspiracy of silence on the part of Ritualists in the interests of Ritualism. The example he brings forward is not a happy one. He actually seems to champion a not very admirable pamphlet, which was received with something little short of downright reprobation by all the members of the Irish Synod when it first appeared. At that time some notices of it appeared in your paper, and I, as some of your readers may recollect, exposed its misstatatements in your columns. The same pamphlet was lately brought before the Synod of the diocese of Dublin, when the Archbishop (whom Canon Crosthwaite calls the President) made just the same exposure of it that I did six months ago. The account of this, which the letter in to-day's *Pulpit* gives, begins: "The prosecutor went through the whole case, fixing every charge up to the hilt." This is a favourite expression, *up to the hilt*, of Irish seditionists, whose usual way of dealing with their fables is to repeat them after they have been completely disproved; as in the case of Mr. Mandeville's death. So it was in this case of the pamphlet before the Dublin Synod. All its statements were just repeated, as if repetition, according to King James the Second's favourite argumentative method, settled everything.

May I suggest to your readers that the Archbishop of Dublin, and an all but unanimous Synod, composed of both Low Churchmen and High, are at least as likely to be right in matters both of fact and opinions as your correspondent? There is an allusion in the letter to the writings of Dr. Littledale, which is not very easy to understand; nor is it easy to understand what rule of silence that author has broken, for surely the *Church Times* generally advocates Ritualism by a method which is not very silent. If the allusion to Dr. Littledale is to his "Words for Truth," what Canon Crosthwaite refers to was treated of in your paper some time ago by another correspondent of yours, a very ill-informed person who was entirely in the wrong. As for the Dublin pamphlet itself, I really think silence about it is the best course that the friends of its author, in his interest, could take.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

29th December, 1888.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Binney, Rev. W. H., Vicar of Witton; Rural Dean of Middlewick.

Bury, Rev. Edward Alexander, M.A., Curate-in-Charge; Vicar of St. Mark's, New Ferry, Birkenhead.

Cooke, Rev. Reginald W., M.A., Incumbent of St. Peter's, Eaglehawk; Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Maldon, Victoria, Australia.

Crawley, Rev. S., M.A., Head Master of Lutterworth Grammar-school; Curate-in-Charge of the Parish.

Crick, Rev. Walter, M.A., Senior Curate of St. George's, Campden Hill; Assistant-Chaplain at the English Church, Via Babuino, Rome.

Delmé-Radcliffe, Rev. Arthur, Vicar of St. Andrew-the-Less, Cambridge; Vicar of St. John's, Paddington.

Fox, Rev. A. C., Head Master of the Grammar-school, Reigate,

Fox, Rev., F. C., M.A., Curate of Benenden, Kent; Rector of Rype, Sussex.

Galpin, Rev. Arthur John, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.

Garnier, Rev. Edward Southwell, Rector of Quidenham-with-Snetterton, Norfolk; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.

Gunter, Rev. W., Curate of Little Sampford; Rector of Abberton, Essex.

Harding, Rev. Edwin Elmer, M.A., General License for the Diocese of Lichfield.

How, Rev. H. Walsham, Rector of St. Anne's, Haughton; Vicar of Mirfield, Yorkshire.

Hughes, Rev. Llewellyn Robert, B.A., Vicar of Portmadoc; Surrogate for the Diocese of Bangor.

Hurst, Rev. John, Vicar of St. Mark's, Tollington Park; Secretary of the Colonial and Continental Church Society.

Hutchinson, Rev. Thomas William, B.A., Vicar of New Buckenham, Norfolk.

Jones, Rev. Prebendary Harry, Honorary Chaplain; Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen.

Linton, Rev. Canon, Vicar of St. Mary's, Birkenhead; Rural Dean of the New Rural Deanery of Birkenhead.

Lowe, Rev. W. H., Chaplain of St. Chad's College, Denstone, Staffordshire.

Macpherson, Rev. Hugh Alexander, Chaplain to H.M.'s Gaol at Carlisle.

Matthews, Rev. William, M.A., Curate of St. David's, Pembroke; Vicar of Warren with St. Twynnell's, Pembroke.

Miller, Rev. J. R. C., Vicar of Mottram-in-Longdendale; Rural Dean of the New Rural Deanery of Mottram.

Nightingale, Rev. William Ridgly, M.A., Curate of Ferring with-Kingston and East Preston, Sussex.

Pennefather, Rev. Somerset Edward, Vicar of St. George's, Jesmond; Honorary Canon of Newcastle.

Plant, Rev. Arthur William, M.A., Chaplain in Her Majesty's Fleet.

Price, Rev. Edward Henry, M.A., late Curate of Holy Trinity, Eastbourne; Rector of Willey, Warwickshire.

Richardson, Rev. John Gray, Vicar of St. Mary's, Nottingham, Honorary Canon of Southwell Cathedral.

Ridgeway, Rev. Frederick E., Incumbent of St. Mary's, Glasgow, Dean of Glasgow and Galloway.

Roe, Rev. Wilfred Thomas, Curate of Cucklington and Stoke Trister; Rector of Poyntington, Somersetshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barrett, Rev. Thomas, B.A., St. John's, College, Cambridge, late Vicar of Sarn, Montgomeryshire, at Shirehampton, Bristol, on the 21st ult., aged 79.

Baynham, Rev. John Francis, M.A., at Charlton Rectory, on the 23rd ult., aged 64.

Cookes, Rev. Henry Winford, at Astley Rectory, on the 23rd ult., aged 75.

De Gex, Rev. George Frederick, formerly Vicar of Christ Church, Frome, at 24, Green Park, Bath, on the 26th ult.

Norman, Rev. Frederic J., Honorary Canon of Peterborough, son of the late Richard Norman, of Melton Mowbray, at Bottesford Rectory, on the 30th ult., aged 74.

Southey, Rev. Charles Cuthbert, M.A., only son of the late Poet Laureate, at Askham Vicarage, near Penrith, on the 22nd ult., aged 69.

Timperley, Rev. W. T. P., Retired Chaplain H.B.M.L.S., at 4, Victoria Terrace, Herne Bay, on the 19th ult.

The Church of England Pulpit.

BICENTENARY OF THE SHUTTING OF THE GATES OF DERRY.

By the Rev. R. R. KANE, LL.D., Incumbent of Christ Church, Belfast.

Sermon Preached in Christ Church, Belfast, on Sunday, December 16th, 1888.

"Let all your things be done with charity."—1 Cor. xvi. 14.

WE celebrate a very wonderful episode in our history. Two hundred years ago this island was the theatre of one of the most eventful passages of history that ever took place in the world. Our fathers did not make their stand for victory and mastery, but for liberty and for life itself. Anyone who takes the trouble to acquaint himself with the actions and the spirit of those with whom our forefathers contended will admit that the issue at stake for them was nothing less momentous than liberty and life. It was not a mere question of which king they would live under, but it was a question of whether they would be allowed to live at all, and if so, whether the liberty, which was as dear as life to them, would be continued or denied to them. For liberty and life they unfurled the banner of William of Orange, who had come in response to an appeal from an oppressed and betrayed nation, and in all the terrible straits to which they were reduced, they were animated and sustained by the remembrance of the supreme issues which depended upon the conflict. We can see how desperate the cause of our forefathers was when we remember that that cause depended, humanly speaking, upon the possibility of a place which was a fortress only in name, holding out against a well-equipped besieging force, skilfully commanded. No wonder that the besiegers treated the challenge with which they were met by the shutting of the gates of Derry as contemptuously as Goliath did the stripling who came to fight him, the mail-clad giant, with a sling and some smooth stones from the brook.

The cause, the triumph of which we celebrate to-day, was reduced, so far as man could see, to the last extremity, when all depended upon the strength of Derry's walls and the skill and endurance of the crowd of civilians who had taken refuge behind them. And yet from December to August the defenders held out, and at ngth deliverance came, and a lasting and glorio victory was vouchsafed to the just and good ca !

Well, brethren, it would seem to be our duty to remember God's goodness to our fathers, and through them to us: but our commemoration will only be justified if it be conducted in a good spirit, and if it bear good fruit. Now the spirit in which our celebrations should be conducted is a spirit of charity—"Let all your things be done with charity." This is the advice of the Apostle, and we may infer the character of the persons to whom this advice is given from the preceding verse—"Watch ye; stand fast in the faith; quit you like men; be strong." They were persons contending for the faith in circumstances of difficulty and trial. I am sure the voluptuous and Pagan Corinthians were greatly embittered against the Christians, and did not like to see their numbers and their influence growing, and in many ways sought to harass and hinder the followers of Christ, and the Christians were tempted to resentment, and perhaps tauntingly to glory in the triumphant progress of their cause. The Apostle tells them in these circumstances to cultivate all manly virtues—vigilance, steadfastness, moral dignity, courage—and to add to these what would strengthen and beautify them all, the heaven-born, heaven-stamped grace of charity—"Let all your things be done with charity." I think it worth while to notice that this charity is commended to those who were capable of the qualities recommended in the foregoing verse. It becomes men to be vigilant, quick to see danger, and ready armed to meet it. It becomes men to be steadfast, not easily swayed in their principles and in their resolutions. It becomes men also to maintain a consciousness of their manhood, of what is becoming to it, and of what is derogatory to it. And how becoming that men should be strong, not fearful and weak, but strong and full of courage. All these things the Apostle enjoins in the thirteenth verse, and in the text he as earnestly enjoins charity, for it is no less a manly quality than the others. No less, did I say? Were it not better to say that it is the crown of manhood? The very bond of perfectness, as St. Paul in another place describes it. Charity then is that which gives unity and strength to the character. Without it, no matter how many and how excellent the other qualities which constitute the character of an individual, that character is deficient in oneness, and all the parts of it do not aim consistently and directly towards the same high consummation. But when charity is superadded to such other virtues as those enjoined in the thirteenth verse, then those elements of character are like a well-marshalled army led according to a carefully prepared design towards a definite and desired object by a general who knows how to combine the forces under him, and to direct their operations and energies with the best effect. Or charity is like the builder who knows how to arrange the materials at his hand so as to construct

an edifice in which all the different materials shall be arranged with the best effect and to the most advantage. Now we who take a prominent part in the controversies of the day on the side of what we believe to be truth and liberty, and who commemorate the virtues of our fathers that we may emulate them in our own struggles to maintain the privileges which, under God, they secured to us—we have great need to cultivate, to follow after this crowning grace of charity, and as the Apostle says, to let all our things be done with charity. We should be moved to this by the recollection that those who are opposed to us are not aliens and strangers, but our fellow-countrymen—those with whom we have continual intercourse in the business and amenities of life. We meet them in the mart and on the street, and in various works of beneficence and associations for the pursuit of knowledge, and our regret often is that there should be any reasons why our intercourse should not be of a closer and friendlier nature. It is certainly needful in things which affect such persons that we should be careful to do them in charity. If they were our enemies the Gospel precepts enjoin upon us that we should love them. If their wont was to hate us and despitefully use us and persecute us, still it would he our Christian duty not to hate them in turn and maltreat them, but to pray for them and to return them good for their evil. But we can scarcely regard them as our enemies. They are, indeed, divided from us by religious belief, and their aims in other matters are the opposite of ours, still all this does not constitute them our enemies, does not deprive them of the right to be regarded as our fellow-countrymen, our neighbours, and even our fellow-Christians, and if we are bound by the Gospel of Christ to love our enemies, how much more must we feel under an obligation to cherish a kind regard for and to love those who are related to us in so many and such sacred ways. I am sure many of you feel, as I do myself, very strongly that a fellow-countryman, a neighbour, and a fellow-Christian is one for whose feelings we should be tenderly considerate, and unnecessarily to wound or exasperate such an one would be a most unmanly and unchristian thing. But, further, Christian brethren, the very assumption on which we go that we have the truth, that we have the Gospel, that we have the grandest privilege of which any people can make their boast—an open Bible—this very assumption imposes upon us a paramount duty—the practice of charity to those who are not so blessed. When we really understand the Bible and the Gospel and the truth, when our possession of those privileges is not made an occasion for idle, and, perhaps, sometimes for offensively obtrusive vaunting, but an occasion for devout thankfulness to God for His grace, and also an occasion for humble acknowledgment of our unworthiness, then, indeed, our feelings towards those who are not so privileged as we are shall be far removed from enmity. We shall be filled with compassion towards them, and desire nothing so much as to impart to them the privileges which we so value ourselves, and which have proved such a blessing to us. When we see a people steeped in ignorance, capable as a people of crimes of the darkest and most cruel nature, misled by men in whom they trust as their guides and champions, when we see the name of Irishmen, which they bear in common with ourselves, covered, in the eyes of the civilised world with dishonour, are we not touched with pity for them? And as we think of what we have, and they have not, do we not feel that their moral and social condition is more their misfortune, so to speak, than their fault? And if Protestant Ireland is not undergoing a process of vivisection, morally and socially, it is because Protestant Ireland has the Gospel, the Word of God, the Truth, which a foreign religion has taken away from our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. We have all reason, indeed, to blush red with shame for the stories descriptive of the moral and social life of parts of our native land unfolded from day to day at the present time. The Pope the other day refused to bless some relics and medals presented to him by an Irish priest, when he ascertained that they were destined for Ireland. And what did the Pope say on that occasion, as reported? "I cannot bless them. The Irish people are disobedient. They prefer the gospel of Dillon and O'Brien to the Gospel of Jesus Christ!" When did the Pope give the Irish people the "Gospel of Jesus Christ." The very men whose gospel the Pope puts in antithesis to the Gospel of Jesus Christ are treated by the Pope's chief representatives in this country as martyrs and heroes, and the Roman Catholic Irish prefer their "gospel," because they see them feasted and petted by the Pope's archbishops and bishops and priests in Ireland. Would to God that the Pope would repent of his apostasy from the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and give that blessed Gospel of love and peace, and truth and honesty, and salvation to the Irish people; for then, most likely, the Irish people would receive and obey it, as their fault has not been, as the Pope ungratefully charges, disobedience to the Papacy but slavish, blind, unreasoning submission to all its dogmas and to all its commandments of men. But to return to our subject. When St. Paul saw the spiritual blindness and destitution of his countrymen how was he affected towards them? He tells us in the 10th chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, "My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they might be saved," and also in the 9th chapter, "I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to

to the flesh." We who have the truth and the light—the truth of God's Word and the light of the Gospel of Salvation should desire to impart those blessings to all who are ignorant of that saving truth, and destitute of that glorious light. But, further, we owe it to our own religion that we should be animated by charity and practise it. What is, in brief, our religion? Our Lord has summarised it for us, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind, and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Is not the profession of such a religion as that a mockery and a profanity if that profession is not steeped in charity, and if that charity be not as comprehensive and practical according to our ability as the parable of the good Samaritan? Let us honestly and earnestly aim at consistency in our profession of this holy religion, and so shall not only our own claim to the true religion be justified, but its beauty and its truth will commend itself to others, disarm their enmity, and possibly, by God's blessing, win them over from their error. Two missionaries landed in an island in Fiji. The natives met them with their clubs, scowling and menacing the missionaries, but these latter knew the character of the people well, and turning to one and another said, "My love to you; my love to you," and the scowls and the menaces gave place to friendly interchanges—a wonderful illustration of the possibility of what St. Paul exhorts us to—"Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." And, brethren, the special position we take up makes the cultivation and practice of charity the more incumbent upon us. We associate ourselves together not for the mere purpose of idly commemorating past events, however interesting and glorious, but because it has been found that principles and privileges can be best defended by those who hold them and value them, banding together for their maintenance and spread. If for social or moral reforms men who desire them find it necessary to band together, it is plainly as necessary for men who desire to defend political privileges, and to advance political principles to band together, and those who thus band together cannot be charged with any breach of charity when the fact of their association, its badges, and its mottoes give offence to those who are not in sympathy with it and opposed to it. I am sure a temperance procession, with its banners and mottoes and legislative programme, such as I have often seen, must be distasteful to some sections of the community, but the temperance associates are quite innocent of any breach of charity, even though their proceedings cause offence. They can conduct their proceedings with the most perfect charity, and, at the same time, be a cause of offence and exasperation to those who are opposed to the objects of their association; and political unions cannot hope to be more successful in this respect than temperance. We cannot forget the past. It would be ungrateful to bury in oblivion the names and heroism of the men of Derry, who for months braved hunger and sword and death in its most terrible forms that they might secure for us the inestimable blessing of civil and religious liberty. We mean no offence by the commemoration. It is an act of filial gratitude on our part, and we regret that any should be offended by it. But it is more than an act of filial gratitude. The cause for which they suffered and fought is as dear to us as it was to them, and it is exposed to peril and surrounded by enemies as it was in their day; we, therefore, unite in memory of their deeds the better to defend the cause and the principles which they so triumphantly defended. We don't mean offence; we mean defence of what is precious to us, and what we hold in trust for those who are to come after us. But since our position forces this duty upon us, we are all the more bound to cherish and practise charity. Brethren, if we have not religion in our hearts we cannot practise charity. The love of God and the love of our fellow-man is the precious fruit of the Holy Spirit's work in the heart of the Christian. If we have not this love, and if instead a spirit of enmity and persecution dwell in us, it is because we have not submitted our hearts to the new-creating power of the Spirit of God; and, remember, the God whose cause true religion is, asks for and will be satisfied with nothing less than the love and service and homage of the heart. He does not say, "My son, be ready to do this, and be willing to do that, but He does say, "My son, give me thy heart. And when we listen to this Divine appeal, and yield our hearts to God, then shall that charity to which we are exhorted by God's grace spring up from within us as a well of water springing up to everlasting life, and in the practice of it we shall, as much as lieth in us, live peaceably with all men. Brethren, let all your things be done in charity; in lodges and in your public proceedings let charity distinguish you; by example and precept impress upon the younger brethren the beauty and importance of charity; follow after charity, and the God of love and peace shall be with you, and may He give you His peace now and for evermore.

THE promotion of the Rev. A. H. Delme Radcliffe to the living of St. John's, Paddington, is a very great loss to Cambridge. The parish of St. Andrew-the-Less, Cambridge, offers a sphere of very great importance; it is very large and is growing rapidly, for though three districts have been cut out of the original parish, and the portion which is left under the direct charge of the vicar contains three churches, there is need for additional accommodation. It is to be feared that the change of the incumbent may delay the carrying out of the plans which were under discussion for meeting this need. The present vicar has exercised a very remarkable influence in this important sphere, and his work has reacted favourably on the religious condition of the whole town.

AGNOSTICISM.

By the Rev. G. HERBERT CURTEIS, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Lichfield, and Professor of New Testament Exegesis, King's College, London.

Sermon Preached for the Christian Evidence Society, at Christ Church, Lancaster Gate, W., on Sunday, December 23rd, 1888.

"And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, He said unto him, 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.'" —Matt. xii. 34.

OUR subject this afternoon is Agnosticism. But before entering upon it I wish to direct your thoughts to a preliminary matter of great importance, if we desire to discuss Agnosticism profitably. For, however paradoxical it may sound, the very first condition of dealing successfully with any form of error is *to feel a sincere sympathy with those that hold it.* Otherwise how can we hope to enter into their feelings? How can we expect truly to think their thoughts? But if we fail to do this, we may easily miss our opponents' real meaning altogether, and may find that we have been expending our strength in fighting against a shadow, and have been contending—perhaps bitterly and fiercely—against some form of misbelief that no man ever has held or will hold. When the two knights in the fable, who had fought for their opinions about the shield that was gold on one side and silver on the other, lay bleeding in the dust, they at last perceived that a little patient good humour would have saved them from a very embarrassing situation. How much more embarrassing and painful is the situation of those who, earnestly aiming on either side to abate the miseries and clear up the perplexities of this mortal life, tilt at each other and lay each other in the dust for a mistake. But saddest of all is the situation when *religious* belief is the question at issue. For no one who reads history, or who exercises common observation, can fail to see that the most effective of all remedies against the miseries and perplexities of this mortal life is some tenable and reasonable form of religious belief. How happy would it be, then, both for the future of our country and for the peace of thousands of souls, if religious controversy could be softened by mutual explanation, and some way of reconciliation could be made clear!

How can such a way be made clear? Only by remembering that we are all, in these days, passing through a period of transition; and that, in such a period, the one virtue of paramount importance is the virtue of patience. Whoever, therefore—by word or by deed, by refraining from heated language and over-hasty judgments, or by treating opponents with scrupulous courtesy and respect—teaches the supreme lesson of patience amid controversy, that man, whatever his opinions may be, is a peacemaker and a helper of the truth. And to him those kindly and encouraging words of the Saviour may confidently be applied, "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God."

Now, it is precisely this attitude of patience and suspended judgment, which, I believe, was meant to be taken up by those who originally invented the word "Agnosticism." It is not a word which point-blank denies anything. It is not "Atheism,"—though it is sometimes most unfairly so misunderstood. It is not even "Scepticism"—which means a hopeless and endless looking after truth, without any definite principles at all by aid of which truth may be discovered. No: "Agnosticism," properly speaking, is neither of these things. If it were either of them, why invent a new word to express what is perfectly well expressed already? But a new position having to be assumed—a position of patient waiting and of disclaiming the absurd pretension to a scientific knowledge of God—a new word was obviously wanted. And it was found by Professor Huxley—at a social gathering, it is said, about thirty years ago—in the Greek word inscribed by the Athenians on their altar to "the Unknown God" (ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ).

Thus the Agnostic—at least, in the first instance—claims nothing beyond a suspension of judgment. There is, it is true, an air of weariness about his attitude; and there is in his words a certain fine scorn—not wholly undeserved—for the tedious methods of theological wrangling. Nay, there is a visible suspicion that nothing good can ever come of religious investigation. But still his chosen and appropriate word does not say all that. It seems meant rather to suggest suspense, patience, rest, and a courteous avoidance of rude denial. The Agnostic, therefore, may be likened to a man who, having left his village-home and travelled along a dusty, weary path, has reached at last a point where two ways diverge. And there he sits him down to rest. His village-home was the quiet abode of primitive childish unquestioning belief; the dusty path is the inevitable progress of religious inquiry and "honest doubt;" the point of rest and of temporary suspense is the point of a dawning suspicion that perhaps God is, after all, unknowable; and that religious truth cannot be found by the intellect of man.

But observe, we may all of us quite innocently advance as far as this. Every educated Christian, who has leisure and opportunity to think religious problems out and, like a man, to "fight his doubts and gather strength," comes at last to this resting-place. He reaches the conviction that by the way of the intellect God is not to be found. Intellect, indeed, purifies our conceptions from superstition and falsehood; intellect criticises documents, weighs various readings, determines

the meaning of words, separates legend from history, discriminates poetry from prose, examines nature with microscopes and telescopes, and finely analyses even the thoughts and feelings of the human mind. But there is one thing that intellect can never do, it cannot find out God. God refuses to be found that way. So that, thus far, whether you call a man a Christian or an Agnostic, it makes no difference. They have both left the same tranquil home; they have both advanced along the same toilsome road of inquiry; they have both reached the same wholesome conviction, which was reached by St. Paul, that "if a man thinketh he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know;" they are both assured, with St John, that "no man has seen God at any time"; and they both have come to rest, rather wearily, in the decision of all the great Fathers of the Church, and in the dogmatic statement of the Athanasian Creed, that God is by man's intellect "incomprehensible."

Let them both innocently rest there for a time, and let no man rudely blame them. For of all alike, up to that point, it may be truly said, "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God." How can they be far? They are walking on the King's highway; they have not swerved into apostasy or denial; and they are well advanced, having sat down at a forward halting-place, where the one road forks into two,—and where a great, a final, a fateful decision has presently to be made. Shall I take the left-hand, the downward, the easy, the tempting road—that, persistently advancing by the pure intellect alone, leads through paths of denial and scorn towards Positivism, with its inability to rise above mere humanity; towards Secularism with its worship of things seen and touched and enjoyed; towards Atheism, with its blank conception of a dead universe writhing in awful agonies of clashing mechanism, and purposeless convulsions of fierce energy? Or shall I choose the steep upward road of moral effort, of bracing self-discipline, of awakening enthusiasm for spiritual beauty, of ever-growing sympathy with Christ, and so with God whose image Christ is? Shall I, in short, take the avenue of the heart rather than of the brain? Shall I believe St. Paul when he says, "He that loveth God knoweth God;" and Jesus when He teaches, he that "willeth aright shall know aright"? Shall I, in faith, take the spiritual way, by which myriads even of poor debased and uninstructed people have come to touch the hem of Christ's garment; by which "babes" have attained to mature understanding; and philosophers, consenting to "become fools that they might become wise," have reached the sublimest heights of serenity and peace? It is a true choice of Hercules; it is (as the lately-discovered "teaching of the Apostles" puts it) a parting of the ways. The next step, therefore, from Agnosticism onwards may involve the most tremendous issues, and may decide the question of ultimate arrival either at hopeless apostasy or at everlasting peace.

Yes, that next step onwards is the vital problem. How can it be assisted to take the right direction? May it not be thus? The chief difficulty that suggests itself at this point is, I think, the growing doubt whether there be any such thing possible as a "revelation" from God. And then the mind begins to revolve over and over again all the old threshed-out questions connected with the principal *record* of revelation, the Bible. The pettiest and most childish difficulties seem now to swarm up afresh, as it were, from the ground. They obscure the light; they confuse the judgment. One cannot see the wood for the trees.

But that is a sad confession of weakness and short sight. Suppose, therefore, we determine to take larger and more comprehensive views of the matter, and to approach the question of Revelation from quite auother direction. We may perhaps find that we had very unnecessarily confused ourselves. For "Revelation," of course, means nothing in the world but "unveiling." It means the providential withdrawing of a curtain, the opening of fresh and unexpected *avenues* for the light. The "light" was always there. It was merely the apprehension of the light, the access of the rays to the organs of sense, that needed improvement. And then gradually, fitfully perhaps —πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, "at sundry times and in divers manners"—the long-excluded intelligence makes its way in. The development of the organ, then, by which the light—glancing from heaven upon all things around, and "lightening every man that cometh into the world"—is received, assimilated, and interpreted, that seems to be the main thing required for a revelation. The only obstacle to illumination lies there. And the principal way by which (according to the Bible) mankind are helped to this enhancement of their receptive powers of faith is the election of some to unusual gifts of that kind; that they may, by their special "inspiration," show all their brethren the way to the same higher attainment.

Now, is not all this precisely the method which science assures us is the regular and normal method of advance in this world? And, in particular, has not "unveiling" to fresh light and more perfect intelligence been perpetually going on, by this very process of "selection" or election, ever since life first stirred upon this planet?

The primæval rocks, we are told, were dead; the stones rolled down the mountain-side, and were neither glad nor sorry. The thunder-storm came up; electricity split them; gravitation seized them; chemistry dissolved them. They neither felt, saw, nor understood anything.

But at last the day came when plant-life appeared; and then certain dissolved stones, offered at the spongy rootlets of a fern, were taken up to a higher plane of being. Coursing now through the plant,

the molecules began dimly to *feel* something. The spring approached, and the sap went joyously aloft; the summer-shower came down, and the musk or hydrangea almost visibly exulted; nay, the sensitive plant shrank at a touch, and the sundew slyly closed upon its prey. Was not all this a sort of unveiling—a stage of natural revelation? And was not every advance secured by selection, by election, by privileged individuals and tribes pushing forward in the race?

Next came a far higher and more wonderful unveiling. The dim and dormant sensation of the vegetative world awoke at length to *sight*, to consciousness, to a sort of imperfect knowledge of other creatures, and of the outside world. The plant was seized by a yet higher power, and was appropriated (in certain select species) to the development of animal life. And then the ox began to "know its owner," and the bird to construct its nest; the wild-swan rose on its mighty wing, and migrated from climate to climate; the ant and the bee founded societies, and divided their wonderful labours—with strange, half-conscious intelligence—among their workers. How marvellous a revelation had dawned upon a previously sleeping world!

But the treasures of God were not even yet exhausted, nor His generous gifts at an end. Behold, one day, yet another long prepared revelation, when man stood upon the earth; and to his receptive brain was unveiled the meaning of all these things and the possibility of using and subduing them. How had this amazing revelation been made? It was simply by one additional gift—that of reflex-knowledge, of *self-consciousness*. Thereby he not merely exists like a stone, and feels dimly like a plant, and sees ignorantly like an animal; but, looking within upon his own mind, he has an intuition there of what "law" means, and system, and purpose, and will, and righteousness, and love. And then, looking out upon the world, he exults to detect the same things there also, only on such a vast and infinite scale that he shrinks back in awe, and bows his head in worship. For the first knowledge has been unveiled to him of an existence, in whom (it is true) for untold ages all creatures must have lived, and moved, and had their being; but who was never known or imagined before. It was the first revelation of God.

And now, I ask, can we reasonably conceive that this great unfolding of things that "eye had never previously seen, nor heart conceived" is going to stop precisely there? Because we ourselves are foremost in the files of time, are we to imagine that to us the last word has been spoken, the last unveiling has taken place? Or does the Agnostic hesitate to take a new departure, because he is invited to advance along some novel line of spiritual and moral consciousness, where an elect Hebrew race (gifted especially that way) have taken the lead? If so, should he not remember the singular "new departures" of which the world's history has from the beginning been full? Think of the first bird's song. It was, I suppose, the first pleasure-sound, the first music for music's sake; and it opened a new way, a new form of consciousness and knowledge with which the dry intellect has nothing to do. It may criticise; but what are its criticisms worth? Music goes on its way, regardless of them all. "So many vibrations a minute; such and such wave-lengths of sound; so great a length of brass-tubing; so severe a tension of string or wire";—all this is not knowledge of music. Music goes quite another way; and rejoices in a fresh kind of revelation of its own.

And therefore, when Agnosticism, having reached its temporary resting-point, is preparing to go further, let its votaries remember that "faith," or moral receptiveness, may likewise be a divergence from the ordinary beaten highway of the pure intellect, and yet may be a true enhancement of the human powers, and a path towards heightened consciousness. It may render possible a revelation of what it deeply concerns us to know, and may involve a further unveiling of verities relating to ourselves, to the universe, and to God, which may not be of the sort we are most accustomed to or take most delight in, but which may be true "knowledge" after all.

At any rate, in absence of knowledge, in denial of knowledge, no man surely can find an abiding resting-place. It is in "knowing" that we rest. It is in that full understanding of the hearts around us, which comes of sympathy and love, that we find, even in this world, a peace beyond all words to express. And hence, just as St. Paul would fain carry forward the Athenian Agnostics with his cheerful preaching, "Whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you"; so Jesus, too, encourages the hesitating loiterers with "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God." And not merely that: He also holds out to them a prospect, which none but a dead heart and a seared conscience can possibly turn away from with indifference, when He says "I am come that they might have life; and this is eternal life, that they might *know* Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent."

THE Bishop of Peterborough, writing in the first number of the *Diocesan Magazine*, says:—"This diocese of ours has no proper centre. Its cathedral town and the residence of its Bishop lie at one of its extremest corners, from which stretch away three counties, isolated from each other, as all English counties are, more or less, by that intense county feeling so characteristic of our English life. My able and energetic predecessor, who felt this difficulty as keenly as his successor does, used to say that his diocese was shaped like a pear, and that he lived on the end of the stalk. This description was true to the life, and no one, save a Bishop, can fully realise all that this implies, of difficulty, disadvantage, and discouragement.

Certain HARNESS' Cure.
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
FOR
RHEUMATISM
Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh, writes:—"*The Electropathic Belt has* **completely cured** *me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense agony for two years. I now feel strong and active.*"
Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. **Pamphlet & Advice free on application** to **Mr. C. B. Harness,** *Consulting Electrician,* the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
Only Address,
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W. (*Corner of Rathbone Place.*)
Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 12, 1889.

CONCERNING CHURCHWARDENS.—II.

AT a time when it is becoming an almost universal fact that "the minister introduces irregularities into the service," so that the character of "divine worship" has become less and less of that which the standards of the Reformation appointed, and constant practice exhibited it up to the time of the Oxford movement, the duties and difficulties of the churchwarden as he is and acts, deserve particular reconsideration. Looking over the lists of cases in which these officers, who are the proper "guardians and keepers of the parish, and a quasi-Corporation in respect of the goods of the Church also empowered and bound to exercise an office of observation and complaint, but not of control, with respect to divine worship," have taken action. One is struck, first, with the number of occasions in which their criminal proceedings have failed, and even criminal proceedings have been taken against themselves, at least, costs given, which is about as formidable an issue. Sometimes their complaints were frivolous and vexatious; sometimes informal; sometimes their zeal outran discretion. Then, again, one must notice what an enormous number of cases really fit for "observation and complaint" were winked at, and tacitly assented to for many years past, during the great anti-Reformation movement. So this may occasion a further statement as to the evident causes and possible cure of such an anomaly. When one remembers that these officers exist in every English parish for "observation and complaint," none can brand them as "spies" for observing, or as "informers" for complaining, no more than as "busy-bodies in other men's matters," or "volunteer persecutors," for instituting necessary proceedings. And yet, why is this duty so seldom taken in hand? We dare not assign this default to a dishonest connivance with the clergyman in his notoriously illegal acts and ornaments. Englishmen are too law-abiding for such a moral depth. But may not ignorance, may not timidity due to ignorance, may not isolation, may not potent failures of honest but ill-directed efforts made by others; may not, above all, vexation, delay, and enormous pecuniary risks impending, have a good deal to say with such a strange exhibition of apparent apathy in what "they are by the law obliged to attend to," and have openly undertaken. What then can be done so as to aid and guide those who are ready to do their duty, also to encourage and stimulate the rest—a large majority—who are as yet not ready to do their duty?

Bishop Butler, exemplifying how the design of nature is favourable to virtue, as reason has a natural tendency to prevail over brute force, has the following argument (in Analogy, part 1, Chap. III.):—"Suppose two or three men of the best and most improved understanding, in a desolate open plain, attacked by ten times the number of beasts of prey, would their reason secure them the victory in this unequal combat? . . . Again, put the imaginary case—that rational and irrational creatures were of like external shape and manner—it is certain, before there were opportunities for the first to distinguish each other, to separate from their adversaries, and to form a union among themselves, they might be upon a level, or in several respects upon great disadvantage, though united, they might be vastly superior, since union is of such efficacy that ten men united might be able to accomplish what ten thousand of the same natural strength and understanding wholly un-united could not. In this case, then, brute force might more than maintain its ground against reason, for want of union among the rational creatures." Now, while disclaiming any intention to insult or scorn some by the use of this argument, we apply it solely to Churchwardens to illustrate the cause of their failures and inefficiency in the past, and to point out its cure. Yes; here it is. "Union is of such efficacy that ten men united might be able to accomplish what ten thousand of the same natural strength and understanding wholly un-united could not." Why not, then, begin with "ten men" as the basis of "an union among the rational creatures"—the Churchwardens? Such union is the very best proof and first sign of their being "rational creatures." And if they ask for precedents, we answer: Look around. How has the Irish Land League combination been dealt with in any degree of efficiency? By union of long dissevered parties, who came to see that their disunion was urged to

extremes of very madness and suicidal injury. Ireland's case and cure is just exactly what Bishop Butler goes on to use in further illustration of the infatuation and infamy of non-union. "Or suppose," saith His Lordship, in the same calm stream of deep pure thought, "a number of men to land upon an island inhabited only by wild beasts, a number of men who by the regulations of civil government, the inventions of art, and the experience of some years—could they be preserved so long—would be really sufficient to subdue the wild beasts and to preserve themselves in security from them, yet a conjunction of accidents—*e.g.*, the value of the Irish vote to Ministerial gamblers, etc., etc.—might give such advantage to the irrational animals as that they might at once overpower and even extirpate the whole species of rational ones." Now, the application of this argument needs no unfolding in detail. But an objection may be warded off. "Ten men" are very few to begin with. So they are; but how many men began "the Church Missionary Society?" One man began it. John Venn ("Memoir of Rev. H. J. Venn," pp. 147-8), rector of Clapham, was the projector and one of the original founders of the Church Missionary Society "and a few unknown persons who met together to carry forward the work." And why not the Churchwardens strengthen their hands and clear their way by standing shoulder to shoulder as members of an "English Churchwardens' Union," when they have seen so long what havoc may be wrought by an "English Church Union." This Union is "the missing link." How it would work we forbear to state. But is it not sorely needed? Let it be welded and wielded at once then.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

First Sunday after Epiphany.

WHAT a prayer is this for times of perplexity! and have we not all known them? What a petition for those who have come to a point where two roads meet, and to whose ears no reassuring voice says, "*This* is the way, walk thou in it!" We have all experienced the distressing sensation that with us, in some sense or other, "nothing seems certain but uncertainty"; we have all known the deep feeling of perplexity, which is so hard to bear. Let us then, with such a knowledge vividly present to our minds, take heart as we think of this week's collect. Remember we approach a loving and all-wise Father, we entreat Him to look upon us, His wandering children, out of His infinite love and compassion, we pray that He will receive us. We present before Him our inmost wishes, our hearts' deepest desires. Will He be able to grant our requests? Perhaps not. Often we wish for things which, if granted, would prove but curses to us, good though we have thought they would be. We need to remember, often very seriously, that God is always loving and good, that He *can never deny* His faithful children a *real* blessing, or we should be discouraged and fearful; we should begin to doubt the efficacy of prayer. So let us always bear in mind the Father's love, let us, in obedience to His command, make known our requests unto Him, and, having done so, rest assured that they will receive the best answer. And we may suppose that the rest of the prayer points somewhat in this direction. We may get, as far as we can see, no reply to our prayers, we may be called upon to trust very much, but even should our Father desire this test of our allegiance, we may be sure that the end of the prayer *will* be granted, whatever else we may *not* have; we shall be enabled in God's time and way to *perceive*, *i.e.*, by constant and conscious communion with our Saviour, to gain an *intuitive* sense of His Will; and to *know*, *i.e.*, by study of God's Word and Providences, to grasp the plan of His dealings with us. Once armed with this great power of clear understanding, and strengthened by the energising grace of the Holy Spirit, we may hope to go forth "conquering and to conquer." We shall see the mists of doubt, the dull clouds of fear, vanish before the Sun of Righteousness. "Unto the godly there ariseth up LIGHT in the darkness."

LEPROSY IN INDIA.

WE hope that at least the reading portion of the people of this country are becoming aware of the fact that the plague of leprosy, of which we read in the Bible, is still as prevalent as ever over the greater part, if not the whole, of Asia; and, with increasing facilities of intercourse, is likely to become a danger to Europe. The note of alarm has been sounded in a short article in the *Nineteenth Century* of October, 1888, with the title of "The Firstborn Son of Death," by Mr. Edward Clifford, who, though not a clergyman, has been lately engaged in a mission in connection with the Church Missionary Society, to the English-speaking people of India; and the same journal, in its August and September numbers for 1884, contained articles on the same subject, by Miss Agnes Lambert, which gave the same warning. Europeans in India occasionally contract the disease, and die of it in India, or return with it to Europe. The sensational title of Mr. Clifford's article is a Greek expression for the disease, and does not by any means exaggerate its horribleness and destructiveness.

We do not purpose to inflict upon our readers any detailed description of leprous cases. It is sufficient to say that a passage quoted in Archdeacon Wright's work on "Leprosy and Segregation,"* from Dr. Vandyke Carter, of Bombay, who is the great authority on the subject, shows that leprosy is a bacillary disease, closely resembling pulmonary consumption, except that instead of the lungs it attacks the external parts—the skin, the extremities, and the eyes; and finally permeates the whole system. No cure is known, and Dr. Vandyke Carter thinks it very improbable that any cure can ever be discovered, because of the multiplication of the bacilli in the blood; but we hope, notwithstanding his high authority, that this is not the last word of science on the subject, and that this fearful disease, when in its earliest stages, may yet be found to admit of cure.

* Parker & Co., 1885.

In its more advanced stages it will, no doubt, always be incurable; though the sufferings and the loathsomeness of this as of every disease may be mitigated by medical and surgical care, by cleanliness and careful nursing. An incurable and deadly disease which does not at first attack the vital parts, is necessarily a slow death; and not only malignant sores and tubercles on the skin, but loss of fingers, toes and eyes, are among its common effects.

The cause of leprosy is obscure, and its geographical distribution—being endemic in particular localities—does not appear to throw any light on its origin. It appears uncertain whether it is in the true sense hereditary. No doubt it often runs in families; it is, however, possible, that this may not be genuine heredity, but contagion, which is, of course, more likely to occur between members of the same family than between strangers. Some evidence, though it cannot be yet regarded as conclusive, against the hereditary character of the disease, is afforded by the experience of the orphanage and asylum for the children of lepers, which has been established by the missionaries, in connection with the asylum for lepers at Almora, in Kumaon. Mr. Bailey, who has lately visited it, says*: "The first news that I heard was sad; that leprosy had broken out in one of the boys at the orphanage and he has been removed to the asylum. Here the experiment has been tried of separating the children of leprous parents from those parents, with, of course the parents' consent; and so far the experiment has proved very successful; this being the first case after many years, indeed the only case, where the disease has appeared in any of the children. The parents of this poor lad were both lepers." The proof, however, will not be complete until a considerable number of these children have attained to mature years without showing any inherited taint.

But there is now no doubt whatever that leprosy is contagious. We do not mean infectious like smallpox or scarlatina, but communicable by inoculation. It is possible for a healthy person to be in constant intercourse for years with lepers—Mr. Bailey was so as a missionary and lay minister of religion—without any danger; but if the discharge from a leprous sore gets into a sore or a scratch on an uninfected person, he is extremely likely, if not quite certain, to contract the disease. It is, beyond doubt, in this way that leprosy is propagated; and this affords the justification of the hopeful motto which Archdeacon Wright has put on his title-page, "*Deus dabit his quoque finem.*" With our present knowledge at least, leprosy cannot be cured in the individual, but it may be extinguished in the race by segregating the infected. It is well known that leprosy was once common in all parts of Europe, but in most parts it has now altogether disappeared; and those who read Miss Lambert's articles will probably agree with her that it was extinguished by the segregation of the infected. This segregation was brought about in the first place by the severity of the secular laws which, as a consequence, partly, it is probable, of mere horror at the loathsomeness of the disease, and partly of dread of contagion, enforced the expulsion of lepers from the society of mankind; and in the second place by the humanity of the mediæval Church, which provided asylums for the lepers, and thus, while mitigating their sufferings in the most effectual way, secured the people at large against their contagion. Something, perhaps much, must also have been done for the extinction of the disease by the enforced separation of the sexes in the asylums.

Of course we have no statistics of the decline and extinction of leprosy in our own country, and in Western Europe generally, and no means of estimating how much of this result was due to the segregation of the infected, and how much to the improvements in food and in ways of living which have, beyond doubt, mitigated the intensity of skin diseases generally. But in Norway, where leprosy has continued to be endemic till now, an experiment is in progress which proves the certainty that the disease may be greatly diminished, and the probability that it may be ultimately extinguished, by segregation alone; for during the period of only twenty-four years, to which the statistics before us refer, and among a people of but very slowly changing habits, it is not possible that any great decline of the disease could have occurred spontaneously. According to official Norwegian statistics, quoted and elaborately discussed by Dr. Vandyke Carter in an article printed at length as an appendix to Archdeacon Wright's book, the number of lepers in Norway declined, between the years 1856 and 1880, from 2,113 to 1,606. Dr. Carter moreover believes, and supports his opinion by an elaborate discussion of the evidence, that there ought to be a large correction for undetected cases in the earlier years, and that the real diminution has been about 30 per cent. During the same period the number of lepers in asylums has increased from 235 to 617, though segregation in Norway is, we believe, not compulsory.

A diminution of 30 per cent. in twenty-four years in the total number of persons afflicted with a disease which has been endemic for centuries, is an extremely encouraging result, and shows what ought to be done in India.

The magnitude of the evil is so great that at first sight it appears overwhelming. The number of lepers in India is usually and officially estimated as from one hundred to one hundred and fifty thousand, but Mr. Bailey points out that this is certainly far below the reality; because many cases are concealed from very natural and intelligible, however irrational, motives, and the mild, which are the incipient, cases escape official observation. Mr. Bailey says, "I believe them to number five hundred thousand, and I know there are many medical men and others who agree with me." As the population of India by the last census was a little over two hundred and fifty millions, Mr. Bailey's estimate gives nearly one in every five hundred of the Indian population as tainted with the disease. It is probably the feeling of despair produced by the contemplation of an evil of such magnitude that has till now prevented the Indian Government from making any attempt to grapple with it. Lord Dufferin said to Mr. Clifford that "one might almost as readily undertake to rid India of its snakes as of its leprosy." This might be true, or at least unanswerable, if it were necessary to begin by providing hospitals for five hundred thousand or even one hundred thousand lepers. But this is not needed—at least, it would be possible and desirable to begin with much less. Mr. Clifford proposes that *vagrant begging lepers*—who, as he remarks, are the greatest danger to the community, because it is by them the contagion of the disease is most likely to be spread—

* "A glimpse at the Indian Mission-field and Leper Asylums in 1886-87," by Wellesley C. Bailey. Price 2s. 6d., post free.—John F. Shaw & Co.

should be committed to asylums, where they should be supported and medically cared for at the public expense, and which they should not be permitted to leave. As Mr. Clifford remarks, "it would be no great hardship that each village should thus be called upon to support in an asylum the lepers who already subsist on its alms." Of course the sexes ought to be rigidly separated. This measure would probably be of itself sufficient to check that increase of the disease which there is reason to fear is going on, being promoted by the facility of intercourse due to British rule; and if well administered, it would in time—perhaps in no very long time—develop into a system like that at work in Norway, where, as we have seen, under the influence of the system of segregation the disease has begun to die out.

Only the Indian Government can do this :—only the Government can act over the entire country, and only under legislative authority can leprous patients be detained in asylums. But private benevolence may show the way and set an example. Though all the agencies yet at work are little more than a drop in the ocean compared with all that remains to be done, yet a beginning has been made, and India is studded over with small asylums for lepers, the best of which are under Christian—which in India means missionary—management. One of the earliest of these was opened at Almora, in Kumaon, in 1843, at the private expense of General Sir Henry Ramsay, a Christian veteran, who is still living and working in India. Lepers in India are not only sufferers, but in many cases outcasts, as they were in Europe formerly; this twofold affliction in many cases makes them peculiarly susceptible to the influences of the Gospel of Christ, and among the lepers in asylums missionaries have found very encouraging fruit of their labours. Mr. Bailey, who was formerly a lay missionary in India and worked much among this afflicted class, is now the secretary of a society for Missions to lepers in India, under the patronage of the Marchioness of Dufferin and Ava, which works through the regular missionary societies by making grants in aid of asylums, and providing catechists for them. Though we have not the power to heal lepers with a touch, we cannot imagine a more Christ-like work than to minister to the bodies and souls of these diseased and outcast sufferers. Mr. Bailey's book, the title of which we have given in a note, is the result of a tour of inspection made on behalf of the society, and contains much interesting information. His address is 17, Glengyle Terrace, Edinburgh.

Though it does not bear on the present subject, we conclude by an extract from his book, which illustrates a strange though well known incident in the life of our Lord—it occurred in the asylum at Lohardugga, in Bengal: "After I had said 'Isa sahai,' 'May Jesus be your helper!' which is the usual salutation here, a woman, a wife of one of the lepers, but who had not herself contracted the disease, came forward with a little vessel of oil, with which she anointed my feet. It was somewhat startling to have oil poured over, and even rubbed into one's well polished boots, and on the ends of one's trousers, but Mr. Hahn (the missionary) tells me it is the greatest honour they can do you."

P.S.—Since writing the above, we have received a leaflet signed by Mr. Clifford, stating on the authority of Sir Donald Stewart, late Governor of the Andaman Islands, that all the lepers among the convicts there, in his time, were cured by the application of gurjun oil, a vegetable oil obtained in those islands. We are aware that this has been tried in leper asylums in India without permanent success; but we are now informed that this failure was due to the reluctance of the wretched sufferers to take the trouble required for the necessary rubbing of the entire body with the oil for hours every day. If, indeed, a cure for leprosy has been found, it will take rank in importance among medical discoveries with vaccination and quinine.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." January, 1889. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

THE number opens with an exceedingly interesting paper by Archdeacon Farrar on "The Last Nine Chapters of Ezekiel." Dr. Farrar dismisses Kuensu's opinion that Ezekiel meant his suggestions to be literally carried out. For Ezekiel places the temple nine miles and a-half from Jerusalem; he makes its precincts a mile square, which was larger than the whole area of Jerusalem, and yet places it upon the top of the mountain; and his stream would have had to flow uphill. He also rejects the idea that the sketch is all futurist, or that it is allegorical, or symbolical, and prefers to call the chapters ideal. According to Dr. Farrar the chapters mark the transition of the monarchy into the hierarchy, of the old religion of the Hebrews into Judaic formalism. But this is making Ezekiel responsible for the Scribes and Pharisees, not to say justifying them. On the relation between Ezekiel and the Book of Leviticus the Archdeacon writes concisely and well. It is certainly more than strange to find that although Ezekiel agrees, often even verbally, with the Levitical legislation, he yet passes over the day of Atonement, leaves unnoticed the Feast of Pentecost, ignores the High Priest, and in the division of the land says nothing of the Refuge cities. Dr. Farrar suggests that neither did Ezekiel follow Leviticus nor Leviticus Ezekiel, but that both worked on some common and older document.

Mr. Rendall's paper on "The Scriptural Idea of Priesthood" is not equal to Professor Milligan's. And surely when Mr. Rendall writes, "no personal holiness and no dignity entitled other Israelites to approach the altar or enter the holy place; even the anointed kings of the house of David shared the exclusion of the people from priestly ministrations," he has forgotten 2 Samuel viii. 18 (Heb.); xx. 26. (Heb.); and 1 Kings vii. *passim.*

Dr. Delitzsch's article on "The Old Theology and the New" is rather painful reading. But we hope his sad verdict is partial. Students often forget that there is a world outside the study walls, very little influenced by criticism, and very much by conduct. The Editor has an article on Professor Cheyne, but says very little about him. Professor Driver's paper is short, but it throws much light on 1 Cor. x. 4, Gal. iii. 16, Eph. iv. 8.

Other papers are by Professor Joseph Agar Beet and Dr. Marcus Dods, and the number is quite up to the average, which, for the *Expositor,* is ample praise.

THE *Treasury* for July kindly sent us by the London publishers, Nisbet & Co., contains as usual

most valuable matter. We do not, however, consider that the "Leading Thoughts for Sermons" are up to the average. The *Treasury* would do well to make more of this part of its contents. The sermon by Dr. Talmage on "The Constellation of the Redeemed" is well worth reading. This month a new series of Sunday-school lessons, on St. Mark's Gospel, have begun.

"THE THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY." January, 1889. London: James Nisbet & Co.

WE should be very glad indeed to welcome a new comer into the literary circle, and to speak all such words of praise and commendation as could be fairly spoken to the first number of a new theological magazine, but in this case it is a difficult task. The *Theological Monthly* has for one of its mottoes, "Exorcise the evil genius of dulness from theology," but the evil spirit would seem to have refused to go; he is present—very noticeably present. Of the seven articles—eight if the review of current literature be included—which make up the number not one is really good. Principal Cairns starts the magazine with an article on "Christianity at the End of the Nineteenth Century," and it is the best; but it is too full of generalisations—perhaps inevitably so. Mr. C. Lloyd Engström writes on "Robert Elsmere," and pours out abundant praise. "I regard *Robert Elsmere* as really a witness to Christ," says Mr. Engström, adding, however, that the authoress holds that "orthodox Christianity is untenable." Well, we are old-fashioned, and still think that Christianity which does not hold to the central truths of the Incarnation and Resurrection is no Christianity at all. Those who disbelieve these two dogmas may be eminently respectable moralists, and no doubt are sometimes far worthier citizens than the orthodox in name only, but still they are not Christians in the sense St. Paul or St. John would have understood the term. But we live in an uncommonly childish age. Gush and sentiment are of far more account than principles and beliefs. What does it matter what a man believes if only he talks nicely! If Mr. Engström thinks Mrs. Ward a witness for Christ, we can only reply, *Non tali auxilis, nec defensoribus istis.* Dr. Hyman proposes to popularise the epistles by a more free translation. But one of his arguments seems so strange to us that we can only have misunderstood it. The LXX., he says, was the Bible of our Lord's day, and the Apostles quoted it rather than the Hebrew; but the LXX. is a very lax translation of the Hebrew, therefore a lax translation is quite permissible. Surely Dr. Hayman must know that where the LXX. varies from the Hebrew, in the opinion of the best scholars, it often—not always, of course, but often—is following a different text, and not infrequently a better text. Moreover, generally speaking, the LXX. is not a lax, but a literal, even a slavishly literal, translation of the Hebrew. Professor Witheron writes on "Church Polity a part of Christianity," but he principally tells us that for him Hooker's immortal work has been written in vain. Other articles are by Prebendary Reynolds and Dr. Harrison. We hope the February number will be better, then we shall wish the *Theological Monthly* a long and prosperous career.

A DONOR, per Rev. Canon Fleming, has sent £100 to the Curates' Augmentation Fund.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

TOLERATION.

SIR,—A few weeks ago there was an interesting paper on Toleration and Moderation. Since reading it I have met with a suggestion that John x. 16 should run thus: "Other sheep I have which are not of this *flock*, them also I must bring . . . and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." If this be correct, this will admit of toleration enough.

The twelve Apostles were corrupt, yet our Lord said of them as a body, "Ye are clean." The weakness of the one being compensated by the strength of the other making up the measure of the fulness in Christ. The son of perdition putting himself out of the college. JAMES WESTON.

MR. LAWRENCE AND THE *EIRENIKON*.

SIR,—There are one or two points in the letter of your Armagh correspondent on this subject (who signs himself "Edmund Lawrence") which I should like to notice. If I mistake not, this is the gentleman who went last year to Trinity College, Dublin, and made a searching investigation as to whether there was "a guild" there or not, and then calmly told us that no such organization existed! If a man persists in saying that black is white, or green is crimson, there is little use in wasting time over him; but as you published the misleading statement (to "draw it mild," as they say), one or two of your correspondents went to the trouble of proving the existence of what no one else in their senses ever thought of denying! Lord Plunket, in the Dublin Synod, last October, set the matter at rest, as he openly spoke of the existence of the "guild" in Trinity College.

But, sir, as a member of the Synod, I assert that there was no such "exposure" of "mis-statements" as your correspondent states. I was present, as a member of that Synod, and heard the debate. There was an "exposure," no doubt, when the Rev. E. F. Rambant, of Carysfort Church, Blackrock, told us of the Confessional at St. Bartholomew's Church, Dublin, and when Dr. Wright gave chapter and verse for all the statements in the pamphlet, *Ritualistic Prospects*, as to the teaching of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*. Let your readers get the Rev. C. H. H. Wright's speech delivered in the Dublin Synod (G. Herbert, Dublin, price one penny), where they can see it all for themselves. It is not fair to take up your valuable space with quotations. Dr. Wright is no fool or "ill-informed person." He was Bampton Lecturer; he is examiner in New Testament Greek at London University, etc., and his speech on "Ritualism in Dublin" is well worth reading. Your readers can then make up their minds as to which of the two, the learned doctor or "Mr. Lawrence," of Armagh, is correct in their statements.

We had a splendid, but too short, debate in the Dublin Synod. The Protestant party were full of enthusiasm, the Ritualists cowed and silent, but Lord Plunket, who presided, requested Dr. Wright to withdraw his resolution. If it had gone to a division, the Ritualists would have been nowhere.

A MEMBER OF THE DUBLIN DIOCESAN SYNOD.

IRISH GLEBES.

SIR,—Through accident I have only now seen the letter of "Nemo" in the *Pulpit* of the 8th inst., quoting the statement of one of the secretaries of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, that the Disestablished Church was permitted to *purchase* back the glebe houses; whereas I stated in a previous letter that the houses were restored without charge.

The transaction was in form of a purchase, but for all that there was no price paid. Where there was no building charge, the house, with garden and curtailage was sold to us for ten years' purchase of the value of the land—in other words, we purchased the site at a low price, and the house was thrown into the bargain. Where there was a building charge, the house, with garden and curtailage, were sold to us for the amount of the building charge, without any charge for the land; and by an amending Act passed three years later, the building charges were paid back to the Church representative body, to be used in putting the glebe houses in repair. Thus in neither case had we to pay for the houses.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 23rd December, 1888.

THE Ven. Benjamin Philpot, of Mina Lodge, Oak Hill, Surbiton, Surrey, late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, who was formerly Vicar-General of the Isle of Man, and Archdeacon of Sodor and Man, entered upon his hundredth year on the 9th inst., having been born on January 9, 1790. He received the gold medal for "Reading" at Cambridge, and graduated at Senior Optime as far back as 1812.

THE Dean of Rochester, in reply to his critics who had condemned him for saying, in effect, that temperance is a greater virtue than teetotalism, says that teetotalism is a modern idea, and he could not be expected suddenly to desert the teaching of Christendom for modern innovation. Canon Basil Wilberforce, writing to the *Times* on the teetotal question, in reply to an anonymous correspondent, says:—"The principle underlying total abstinence is no 'recent and human invention.' It is at least as old as Calvary, and inspires the splendid logic of the 14th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. Under the conviction that the principle of the Gospel pleads with the strong to stoop to the level of the weak, and by leading the way and setting the example bear their burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ, Lord Wriotesley Russell signed the pledge at an advanced age. Some years afterwards, at a meeting in Exeter Hall, he publicly declared that whereas during his long ministry, previous to adopting the principles of total abstinence, he had not succeeded in rescuing a single drunkard, since he signed the pledge he could point to several who had entirely reformed."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Blackett, Rev. S., Rector of Wareham, Dorset; Surrogate for the Diocese of Salisbury.
Blakiston, Rev. R. Milburn, Deputy-Chaplain at Whitehall Chapel.
Bryans, Rev. E de V., Vicar of Holy Cross, Shrewsbury; Private Chaplain to the Bishop of Lichfield.
Buck, Rev. G., Curate-in-Charge of Egginton, Burton-on-Trent; Curate-in-Charge of Little Eaton, Derby.
Dewing, Rev. A. M., Curate-in-Charge of St. Mary's, Mission Church, Redcliff, Bristol.
Duke, Rev. Edward St. Arnaud, M.A., to the District of St. Dunstan's, Earle Road, Edge Hill.
Hayward, Rev. S. Curling, Vicar of Pilsley; Acting-Chaplain to the 2nd Vol. Batt. Derbyshire Regiment.
Hull, Rev. R. B., Vicar of All Saints', Northampton, and Rural Dean; Honorary Canon of Peterborough Cathedral.
Hurman, Rev. Robert; Rector of Kirkby Underwood, Lincolnshire.
Johnson, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Senior Curate of All Souls', Leeds; Incumbent of Durban, Diocese of Maritzburg.
Johnstone, Rev. Richard, Rector of Moreton Say; Rector of Stone, Staffordshire.
Kavanagh, Rev. J. D., Curate of Withycombe; Chaplain of Exeter Hospital.
Kelly, Rev. Henry, Chaplain to the Forces (fourth class); Chaplain to the Forces (third class).
Marshall, Rev. F., Curate of Byfleet, Surrey; Curate-in-Charge of St. Michael's Mission, Leeds.
Nicholl, Rev. Charles Southey, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Matthias's, Liverpool.
Patey, Rev. Charles N., Vicar of West End, Southampton.
Power, Rev. John Pocklcton, M.A., Rector of Goadby Marwood, Leicestershire.
Poyntz, Rev. N., Vicar of St. Mary's, Shrewsbury.
Rigby, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Warrington.
Roberts, Rev. Griffith, M.A., Vicar of Dowlais; Rector of Mackynlleth.
Ross, Rev. James Coulman, M.A., late Vicar of Baldon, Oxford; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of York.
Savage, Rev. E. S., Curate of St. Margaret's, Westminster; Vicar of St. Mark's, Barrow-in-Furness.
Stephen, Rev. C. J., General License by the Bishop of London.
Stephenson, Rev. E. H. C., Senior Curate of the Parish Church, Staveley; Sole Charge of the New District of St. Monk's, Mansfield.
Surgey, Rev. Herbert Henry, B.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Symonds, Rev. Canon, Rector of St. Mary's, Stockport; Rural Dean of of Stockport.
Teesdale-Mackintosh, Rev. W., M.A.. Vicar of Thirsk; Rural Dean of Thirsk.
Tonge, Rev. Richard, M.A., Honorary Canon of Manchester; Rector of St. Mary's, Manchester.
Truscott, Rev. Howard J. H., Senior Curate of St. David's, Birmingham; Curate of Eastnor, Ledbury.
Tyrwhitt, Rev. C. B., Vicar of Cauldon and Waterfall, Staffordshire,
Watson, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Vicar of Cransfold, Suffolk.
Welldon, Rev. James Edward Cowell, M.A., Head Master of Harrow School; Honorary Chaplain to the Queen.
Willis, Rev. Charles Francis; Rural Dean of Graffoe.
Windle, Rev. W. E., M.A., Curate of St. James's, Piccadilly; Vicar of Ugborough, near Ivy-bridge.
Wingate, Rev. George, M.A., Rural Dean of Shifnal.
Wood, Rev. F. J., Vicar of Headingley; Honorary Canon of Ripon Cathedral.
Wood, Rev. Samuel Theodore, Curate of St. Mary Magdalene's, Paddington; Rector of Hilperton-cum-Whaddon, Trowbridge.
Woodward, Rev. George Ratcliffe, M.A., Rector of Chelmondiston, Suffolk.
Wynn-Griffith Rev. G. R., Vicar of St. Michael's, Tividale, Staffordshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Armitage, Rev. Francis James, Vicar of Casterton, at Bournemouth, on the 3rd inst., aged 66.
Benson, Rev. Thomas George, at 3, Violet Terrace, Seaton, Devon on the 5th inst., aged 41.
Booth, Rev. Samuel, only son of the late Rev. S. Booth, Rector of Holy Trinity, Salford, at Northampton, very suddenly, on the 29th ult.
Chandler, Rev. Henry Christian David, M.A., Rector of Steventon, formerly Vicar of Waterbeach, at Funchal, Madeira, on the 17th ult., aged 51.
Lobley, Rev. Joseph Albert, M.A., Vicar, at Sedbergh, Yorkshire, on Sunday, the 6th inst., aged 48.
Morton, Rev. Clement J. F., M.A., Vicar of Goole, late of Sheffield, at the Vicarage, on the 5th inst.,
Parkinson, Rev. Stephen, D.D., F.R.S., Fellow and late Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge, at Newnham, Cambridge, on the 2nd inst., aged 65.

The Church of England Pulpit.

MANIFESTATIONS OF GOD.

By the Rev. JAMES B. KEENE, M.A., Chaplain to the Bishop of Meath.

Ordination Sermon Preached at Mullingar on St. Thomas's Day, December 21st, 1888.

"We are labourers together with God."—1 Cor. iii. 9.

SUCH is the Apostle St. Paul's description of the ministerial office, and it is a noble one. Not that it is, however, to be supposed that none but those in that sacred office are called to be labourers together with God.

For in a wide sense of the word all workers in the world, in their ordinary lawful engagements, may deem themselves labourers together with Him. Assuming the one Article of the Creed which seems (leaving sophistry aside) to be most naturally and universally written on the hearts of men, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth," we see that all men are called in some degree to be labourers together with God. For if nature, as our Creed declares, proceed from God, what ordinance is that which we find inscribed upon its whole constitution? Is it not a demand for this co-operation? Nature seems to cry out for man's help to enable her to give forth her powers and yield that which is in her. Let me illustrate what I mean.

1st. Agriculture.

Nature has within her a wonderful potency of yielding support for human life by the fruits that spring forth from the ground. But how are these to be obtained? Is it without labour? No; for let a field be ever so well cultivated, and by that culture be taught to produce abundantly, it will not continue to do so if man cease his labour. The whole will degenerate, and weeds and briers will spring up where once stood the golden grain. Again, by labour and co-operation with nature, simple, unpretending flowers have assumed most beautiful and perfect forms, so that we could scarcely recognise their ancestry; but neglect them, withdraw the human care and toil, and they will degenerate and revert to their original type.

2nd. Science.

This century has been an age of miracles in the results of man's co-operation with nature in the department of science. The whole of our civilisation has been transformed by it. The facilities of transit, the communication of intelligence, the infinite forms of manufacture achieved through the fertile combinations of machinery, would seem a romance to our forefathers. And yet all the potentialities of steam and electricity were existent in the world 2,000 years ago as truly and fully as they are now; but nature had to wait for man to labour with her before she could show what lay enfolded in her bosom.

3rd. Art.

And so likewise has it been with Art. What a spell music can exercise over those subject to its control. A song of fatherland has served to stir the hearts of a nation to action. All the possibilities of music are within nature, but they are hidden and unknown until man comes to her assistance. He forms the instrument, and even then that instrument remains silent, until the master-hand of man touch the keys of the organ, and awaken the power that lies dormant within, and the church or cathedral is filled then, but not till then, with deep-swelling notes, or whisperings as of music from above.

In fact, whatever be the department of nature to which we turn, we find this cry to man to come and help her, to labour with her, that thus by his help she may yield forth in return that which she is conscious of having within to answer to his toil.

And ought not this to add a dignity to all the lawful occupations of man. If we regard this constitution of nature, by which she seems to call upon man for co-operation, as an ordinance of God, may not the labourer, the man of science, the artist and musician, learn to do their work in a nobler spirit by reflecting that in a sense, in all their work, if they do it rightly, they are labourers together with God. We can learn this lesson from the Bible. The fact of work being in a sense a co-operation with God seems to have been recognised by the Jews, for it pervades many of the scenes and Psalms of Scripture. "Behold Boaz came from Bethlehem, and said unto the reapers, The Lord be with you; and they answered him, The Lord bless thee." Does not that recognition of the Almighty in connection with the simple incident of farm labour throw a grace into the scene, and elevate it to quite a higher level. The Psalms and lessons appointed for our harvest and thanksgiving services furnish ample illustrations of what I mean. "These all wait upon thee, that thou mayest give them meat in due season. When thou givest it them they gather it, and when thou openest thy hand they are filled with good." Paul plants and Apollos waters, but God giveth the increase.

And as the labourer in the field, so the man of science. In his exploration of the secrets of nature—secrets which only by his help she can bring forth—he, too, may surely do his work with this nobler sense of being a labourer together with God. Many a man of science has so pursued his studies, and has it not exalted his toil? A devout spirit adds lustre to the highest scientific fame.

So likewise of Artists. We know as a fact that some of those old masters, whose works we still study as models of skill, did approach their work in this spirit. Many of their subjects were sacred ones, and we have it on record of some that they never went to their labour without preparation upon their knees, seeking as they pourtrayed the sacred scenes, and, above all, Christ, the Holy One Himself, for the inspiration of that Spirit which has been promised to all who seek it. And by the contemplation of those very monuments of devotion have not men before now been led to bend the knee at the Cross of Christ, and thus an answer has been given to prayers offered up ages before?

And once again of Musicians. Have not some made their very compositions a kind of prayer to the Almighty? And have not the emotions awakened by their outpourings of soul oftentimes moved us nearer to God?

May I not add that there is a special call for this devout spirit in all who take part in the music of the Church of God. If all who did so made it their habit earnestly to pray that what they sang with their lips they might believe with their hearts, and what they believed in their hearts they might practise in their lives, their singing would always be something more than a mere accurate conformity with musical notation, or correct reproduction of musical symbols, and would have an influence truly religious, and be an acceptable sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God, and be a means of grace to our souls.

My object in making these remarks so far has been to point out that whatever be the sphere of life in which we are engaged, it is possible for us to cultivate in it a devout spirit, and so rise to the realisation of the dignity which God has attached to all honest and lawful labour, viz., that of being labourers together with Him.

But now I wish to show that this is pre-eminently true of the ministerial office. We can, I think, learn somewhat both from the analogies and differences that exist between this and secular work.

First, the Analogies.

1st. The Analogy of Mystery. We have seen that the most valuable secrets of science remained hidden for ages. Many modern discoveries would have been of immense value to the ancients, and they lay to their hand quite as much as to ours; but they knew not of them. And in the present day, in uncivilised lands, there are millions destitute and ignorant of the most common and apparently indispensable luxuries of modern civilisation. This seems strange, perhaps, but does it not reflect a light upon the analogous truths with regard to religion? There are in it also many valuable truths which lay hidden for ages, and which are still unknown to multitudes of mankind. As God leaves man to search for natural truth for himself, giving him certain opportunities and faculties which he is to use in seeking after it, so to a large extent has it been with regard to spiritual truth. God has permitted the law of a gradual unfolding to take place in both. Such unfolding of what was long hidden and unknown the Apostle denominates a mystery. Under this title are included the redemption of mankind, the manifestation of the Gospel to the Gentiles, and the revelation of everlasting life. God allows the progress in both spheres to be a gradual one, and dependent, to a large extent, on the exercise of the faculties and opportunities given. There is to be in both the law of labour, the law of co-operation, the seeking after God to ensure the finding of Him. All this may appear strange to us, but it is worth observing that whatever difficulty exists in one sphere exists also in a degree in the other. And I think the whole law furnishes a strong concurrent testimony to the immortality of the soul, for more value seems to be set by God upon the process of training human beings to use what he has given them, than upon endowing them with fresh gifts. Every step taken in onward progress becomes a platform for another, so that if death really terminated the existence of man, there would be a terrible *lacuna*, a violation of the great onward law which seems to pervade all things. For from every position attained either in the knowledge of nature or of God there open forth fresh corridors that are meaningless and monstrous mockeries if they do not lead on to fresh and unknown chambers, and treasures of glory and of grace beyond. The analogy of what we can see gives us the light of hope for and faith in what we cannot see. This stress that seems to be laid by the Power that guides us upon our training, I say, appears to furnish a strong collateral testimony to a future life, as it alone can refute the charge of the futility of all such training.

2nd. Another analogy between labours of the natural and spiritual kind is the demand that exists in both for pains, perseverance, and devotion. For what is the secret of success in all kinds of work? Does it not lie in these? What profit may the slothful labourer expect from the fields? None. What results can careless work on the part of a composer, artist, or man of science produce? In none of these can success be attained without genuine devotion to work and interest in it.

And how can we who have entered upon the sacred calling succeed, or do genuine work, if we do not throw ourselves into that work; if we do not feel that there is a work for us to do, and that we want to do it? The work is for the souls of men, and the soul of man, if neglected, will as surely degenerate as will the untilled field. Therefore on the day of our ordination there is a solemn question put by the bishop, the substance of which was prescribed so far back as the Council of Carthage, which many a one has found it hard to

answer truly, and perhaps has been perplexed in determining whether he has answered honestly. "Do you think in your heart that you be truly called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this Church of Ireland, to the order and ministry of priesthood?" This double interrogative inquires into the possessions on our part of two qualifications. For it asks —

1st. Whether we believe and feel that direct spiritual work for God and our Lord Jesus Christ is a kind of work into which we can throw ourselves heart and soul?

2nd. Can we do so upon the lines and according to the order laid down by the Church to which we belong?

The reply to this solemn question is left to our own conscience, and for our own sake, for the sake of others, and for God's sake we ought to be honest in our answer.

If we cannot answer both one and the other part of the question honestly we have little business in the ministry, for our lives must necessarily be but miserable, contemptible things, ineffective—aye, I fear absolutely injurious and disastrous. If we have no heart for the work, and can find no interest in it, how wretchedly must it be done, what absolutely useless beings we must become!

3rd. One other analogy that I may mention between secular and spiritual things is that there is room in both for the exercise of all our powers for our highest and humblest gifts. There is room in the ministerial office for the employment of the highest intellectual gifts. This day reminds us that one of the disciples of Christ, and a true disciple, was St. Thomas. He was a doubting disciple: He loved our Lord, and yet at one time he doubted. There are many such now, for according to the analogy which I have been pointing out, as there are difficulties in the explanation of the order of the physical world which long baffled the acutest intellects, so is it also with the spiritual world.

The motions of the planets were once thought to be without any order, and so received their name which signifies "the wanderers." So also many things in the spiritual world appear at first to be in disorder—hard to reduce to system. The reconciliation of these discords, and the reduction of apparent chaos and confusion, to real cosmos and order, afford scope for the exercise of the keenest intellect in contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. Yet we have, I think, attained but little perception of the depth of our spiritual nature and the necessities of man's soul if we cannot have a little patience and believe that, as in the physical world one apparent discrepancy after another has been removed by fuller and riper knowledge, so will it be found true in spiritual things. Blunders may be made in the pursuit of religious as they have been made in the pursuit of scientific truth; but in one as well as the other the mysteries will be gradually revealed, and if we will only learn those lessons of patience and yet fortitude, which God seems to teach in all His government, we shall not be greatly agitated, but shall increase in faith and hope until at last we, in the language of re-assurance, shall be able to exclaim with St. Thomas, as we, too, once more behold our Master's face, "My Lord and my God!"

But there is room, too, for the exercise of humbler gifts. Yes; for be it thankfully remembered that while, as I have shown, there is room and demand for the highest gifts of mind in the service of the Church of Christ, that the humbler talents, as they may be reckoned by man, of fidelity and constancy in the application of spiritual truth to the hearts of men, these as they are more generally possible and attainable, so are they more universally necessary in this labour for God. All may learn to be in earnest in their work; and earnestness is a more eloquent persuasive to men's souls, and a more powerful spiritual qualification, than all the endowments of the acutest intellect.

And now as I have noticed some of the analogies, let me briefly point out some of the differences between labour in the natural and spiritual sphere.

1st. The difference of Sphere.

The sphere is a higher one. The ministerial office has not to do merely with physical and material things. Our calling has to do with the souls of men. It is this that gives the highest dignity and yet greatest solemnity to the ministerial office. We have seen that in all work there may be the dignity of co-operation with God; but it is to this office alone that St. Paul assigns a special title to that dignity. And how can we wonder when this labour concerns that which is more important than all the subject matter of science, art, and agriculture? for the soul of man is the one thing that possesses the faculty of holding communion with its Maker; the soul alone has a capacity for eternal life; it alone can in any degree become like its Maker. Its possibilities and perils are infinitely greater than those of any other concerned in human effort. It is for the salvation and edification of human souls that the priesthood of the Church of Christ exists. To bring men into nearer communion with God, into a mystical union with Christ, to build them up in their most holy faith, to open their eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, it is for such purposes that this office of the priesthood was founded. The fathers of the Church formed no mean estimate of the nature of the ministerial calling. St. Gregory Nazianzen says:— A minister's office sets him in the same rank and order with angels themselves; he celebrates God with archangels; he has a share in the very offices of Christ himself; he reforms the work of God's hands, and presents His image to his Maker; his workmanship is for the world above. St. Chrysostom says that the office of the priesthood,

though it be exercised on earth, is wholly occupied about heavenly things—that it is the ministry of angels put by the Holy Ghost into the hands of mortal men—and therefore the minister of God ought to be pure and holy as being placed in heaven itself in the midst of those heavenly powers. Let him, he adds, be armed all over with purity of life as with an adamantine armour, for if he leave any part naked and unguarded, he is surrounded with open enemies and pretended friends, who will be ready to wound and supplant him. He, above all others, should be able truly to say: "I live, yet not I, but Christ that liveth in me." And then, drawing a comparison between the ministerial and monastic life, he says the former is more arduous; for that it is more difficult to watch over the souls of a multitude of men immersed in worldly business than to take heed to one who lives in retirement from temptation.

So great a sense had they at that time of the difficulties and responsibilities of the priesthood that we learn from history, and perhaps with surprise, that such men as St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Cyprian and St. Athanasius fled from it when the office was thrust upon them. There were peculiar difficulties and dangers surrounding the office then; but the responsibility—the cure of souls—is still the same, and the solemnity of that responsibility may well make us pause. When we find that there are homes within our cures into which no gleam of Christian influence seems to enter save that which we ministers of the Church of Christ may bring there, are we not tempted sometimes to ask, why did we ever undertake an office of such great responsibility when it is by us so meanly fulfilled? Which of us, too, in attention to the details of parochial organisation does not suffer from the danger that, as it has been said, "amid the distractions of the infinitely small we lose our grasp of the infinitely great." And however true our first ideal of the sacred office may have been, how very easily do we degenerate from being the spiritual guide into becoming merely the kindly friend.

Is not the best safeguard against such perils as these, to continually return upon the sublime thought of the apostles, the sublime nature of our calling, viz., labouring together with God, and to seek continually for the renewal of the gift of the Holy Ghost, that gift that is invoked and assured to all who faithfully expect it at ordination, the gift that can alone enable us ever to do any spiritual work for God.

2nd. Lastly. There is another difference between the labour in the spiritual office and in natural pursuits. It is often said: "Why, if the soul of man be so precious a thing, is the revelation with regard to its needs not more abundant?" Well, we have seen that, if we were to judge by the government of God in the natural world in the discovery of knowledge and in the unfolding of the potency of nature, we ought to expect no assistance whatever—for no scientific truth has been revealed, but religious truth has—so that, in fact, the superior value of the soul of man is at once proved by, and accounts for, the supernatural influences on its behalf; and these have not been few—the giving of the law, the sending of the prophets, the Incarnation of Christ, the gift of the Holy Ghost. Furthermore to the same end—for the building up of the Church and the edifying of the body of Christ—we find the establishment by Christ and His Apostles of a stated ministry, with its various developments and offices of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and the institution of the Sacraments for the establishment, furtherance, and maintenance of spiritual communion, and the confirmation of faithful recipients to all time. Yes, the dignity of this spiritual and ministerial co-operation with God, above all others, is proved by the very existence of the fabric of the Church and the supernatural assistance promised and given to all who seek in its various ordinances for the promised gift of the Holy Ghost, which to-day is specially invoked on behalf of those who will so much need that power that can alone make their office or ministry ever fruitful for God.

I may most fittingly close with a portion of a prayer written by one of the Reformers:—

"We beseech thee also, most dear Father, for all pastors and ministers unto whom Thou hast committed the charge of men's souls and the ministry of Thy holy gospel, that it would please Thee so to guide them with Thy Holy Spirit, that they may be found faithful and zealous of Thy glory, directing always their whole studies unto this end that the poor sheep which be gone astray out of the flock may be sought out and brought again unto the Lord Jesus, who is the Chief Shepherd and Head of all pastors, whereby they may from day to day grow and increase in Him unto all righteousness and holiness; and that it would please Thee to deliver Thy Church from the danger of such idle shepherds and hirelings as seek themselves and their own lusts, and not the setting forth of Thy glory and the safeguard of Thy flock."

MANY INFALLIBLE PROOFS.—ACTS I. 3.

By the Rev, A. E. CLARKE, B.A., Curate of St. Peter's, Islington.

Sermon Preached in Christ Church, Hoxton, on Sunday, December 9th, 1888.

THE proof of Christianity is in its practice. God virtually says to man: "Believe, and I will give you a sign" (John vii. 17); man replies, Give me a sign, and I will believe. Thus he who persists in hankering after signs, in direct

disobedience to God, remains to the end of the chapter an unconvinced, unconverted man. But let a man come with humble and contrite heart, and, prostrating himself before the Throne of Grace, say, "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief," and he will find so many infallible proofs that Jesus hath showed Himself to save sinful man, that he will wonder he ever was so credulous as to doubt! His very scoffing, he will now find, is a testimony to the God whom he insulted before. Quite forgetting that a thousand years are in The Eternal's sight but as a day; quite forgetting that ungodliness will remain ungodliness right up to the Day of our Lord's Second Coming; "for, as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered the ark, *and they knew it not until the flood came and took them off, so shall it be when the Son of Man cometh*"—quite forgetting all this, man scoffing says, walking the while after his own lusts, "Where is the promise of His coming? We have heard all this for years, and everything has gone on just the same from the beginning." Nay, man, *thou* art *not* the same: ofttimes, from the deepest depths of thy degraded nature, has a voice sternly spoken, protesting against thy self-abasement, thy state so fallen from the day when thou wast a little lower than the angels. Moreover, in that very book, which the scoffer calls a collection of fables, it was written over eighteen hundred years ago, that in the last days scoffers should come walking after their own lusts, and saying, "Where is the promise of His coming? . . . . . All things continue as they were from the beginning of Creation." One "sign," therefore, of the "Divine Doctrine," to the now aroused scoffer, is his former state. But this evening I purpose, with God's help, briefly to touch upon four other infallible proofs of the divinity and reality of the Christian Religion. They are the Bible, the Jew, the Sacraments, and Christian Experience.

The Bible must always be our final Court of Appeal. We know it is the Book of God, because its words alone, of all the books that have ever been written in any tongue, of any country of the wide world, have the power of causing man to be born again, which is the end and aim of Jesus Christ's religion. But let us, to-night, examine the evidence of an enemy to the truth of the Sacred Record, wherein we read that it is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the human heart. Strauss, the German sceptic says, that Christianity satisfies the three greatest needs of man; the regrets and reproaches of conscience are set at rest by expiation; the loneliness and helplessness of man are relieved by the living and loving arms of an everlasting Providence; and the sadness and unsatisfactory fragmentariness of life are changed by the promises of eternal blessedness. With regard to the first, how true it is that the human heart sighs for rest and cannot find it, until it finds it in the Lord. The oldest man here present will testify that he has found that "nothing is so disenchanting as attainment." It is the nature of unrenewed man to attain his longing, and yet to long for attainment still; to leave, as each day passes, a legacy of regret for the next, to bury his known wrong-doing in as deep oblivion as he can; to dread lest, "in the dead, unhappy night, when the rain is on the roof," self should demand examination, and the ghost of the buried past should rise again. And all this is done away with for ever by expiation —"The Blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin." So Captain Hedley Vicars found, as the words caught his eye, and—by the Spirit's aid—his heart; and so have found millions of saints who once were restless and cast down, ever seeking, never finding.

Then we are told by Strauss that the living and loving arms of an Everlasting Providence or the sufficing grace that is given us in Jesus Christ relieve the loneliness and helplessness of men. That great scientist, Huxley, is fain to confess at last that "man is a bungle." "I wish I had something," says he, "to wind me up, so that I could go right all day, like a clock." That *something* was supplied for ever when the Prince of Peace taught us to pray, "Our Father, which art in Heaven, give us this day our daily bread;" and Huxley's confession is another proof of how these things have been hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes. Lastly, the sadness and unsatisfactory fragmentariness of life are changed by the promises of eternal blessedness. Before life and immortality were brought to light in Jesus Christ, and even to-day, in regions where people walk in spiritual darkness, how aimless, how sad is, what is too often the drudgery of existence. Says a great Alexandrian philosopher, some years before Christ: "The best thing is never to be born, and the next best thing is to die." And to-day, hundreds of years after Christ, those who have not accepted Him, godless and hopeless, when the day of exceeding bitter wrath finds them out, care not to live. Without a future state of retribution and reward the conditions of human life would appear manifestly unjust. "Remember," says Abraham to the rich fool in hell, "remember *thou* in *thy* lifetime receivedst *thy* good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things." The one bore his poverty, with God as a helper (as his name signifies), the other, as the personal pronouns ("thou," "thy") testify, lived for himself, as if life were his own for ever. And so for Lazarus, his light afflictions of a moment worked out a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; but for the godless man of wealth and position there was reserved the blackness of eternal darkness. Such an one, when too late, finds that

the Bible, which he has neglected all his life, shall rise up in condemnation against him—"They have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them," and then, in the agony of spiritual torment, he begs that some one may be sent to earth to inform his brethren that eternal truths are not the fictions of the pulpit nor the furniture of a fanatic mind.

From this painful incident we may gather that perhaps the strongest proof of the inspiration of the Bible is this, that unconverted men find no pleasure in it, and very rarely read it. "My words are spirit, and they are life;" and the natural man cannot appreciate what can only be spiritually discerned. If men love God, they love His Word. I remember reading, not long ago, of a lady who was asked to read a certain book by a well-known author, in order that she might give her opinion upon its merits. Carefully she read the book, line by line, and page by page, and gave it as her candid opinion that the book was incomparably dull. Not long after this the lady met the author of the book at some society gathering, and they fell mutually in love with each other. She read the same book again eventually; but oh! how differently; how she lingered over every line, and what hidden depth of meaning she now discovered! She loved the author, and so she loved his book. Love God, and His Book will be sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb.

And now, very briefly, we must take the Jew. The Jew and the Bible stand or fall together, for "unto the Jew were committed the oracles of God." "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord God;" and so they are to this day—by six Bible facts, which cannot be disputed. They are expatriated and dispersed over the face of the globe, though no man ever had better title to home and country than they (Gen. xv. 18). Though dispersed, they still remain distinct, and while the Englishman is a *mélange* of the Briton, the Roman, the Saxon, the Dane, and the Norman; the Jew remains unmistakeably the Jew (Num. xxiii. 9). Again, though, as a rule, a harmless and law-abiding people, the Jews have always been a reproach and a bye-word to the nations (Deut. xxviii. 33,37), and have everywhere been persecuted. To be "an old Jew" is to be altogether contemptible: and you have only to read the wars of the Crusades in your English Histories, or the German and Russian papers of to-day, to realise what terrible persecutions the Jews have suffered and are now suffering. Yet, in spite of all this, they are still preserved; for "God is faithful, who promised," and He has said by the mouth of Jeremiah (ch. xxxi. 37): "If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, then will I also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done." But to this day they are as hard-hearted as ever, and the deep sleep of unbelief holds them in its blinding embrace (Ps. xxix. 10), for the veil is on their eyes, even until this day, at the reading of the Old Testament, "which veil is done away IN CHRIST" (2 Cor. iii. 14, 15, 16.) Thus, by his expatriation, dispersion, distinctiveness, reproach and persecution, preservation, and hardness of heart, does the Jew unwillingly prove that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ of God.

Thirdly—Where do the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper come from? Take the latter. If there is one historical fact which is a reliable one, it is that the Lord Jesus Christ instituted the Lord's Supper 1855 years ago. We can travel along a line of historic evidence from A.D. 1888 to A.D. 33 without one stop, till hushed in solemn reverence we stand before our Lord Himself as He breaks the bread and drinks the wine, the evening before His Crucifixion. And to-night may we not, each of us, hear the words sounding in our ears across the cemeteries of buried years: "This is My body, which is given for YOU." Remember ME . . . . I who trod life's suffering way from Bethlehem to Calvary bid you come and believe on me and live! Will ye not remember, and turn and live for evermore?

And, lastly, Where does Christian experience come from? Ask the infidel and any Christless man—he *cannot* answer. Ask the believer, and he will tell you that Christian experience is the virtue which comes from Christ alone. See what it is doing to-day in our streets and in our churches. "It is recalling the outcast, and fighting the demons of intemperance and impurity, while it is enlisting in its service the hope of the coming age." Abroad it is regenerating continents as it carries the Gospel to every creature. Why? Because some hundreds of years ago there stood up One on earth and boldly proclaimed that He was come to seek and save the lost; and having died and gone up to heaven, whence He came, to prepare a place for them, He as boldly transmitted His commands to *His disciples* of all ages to go and do likewise, vouchsafing them, through the Spirit, the everlasting efficacy of His Presence. And so to-night, in obedience to Him, I stand up here, and beseech all unreconciled ones to be reconciled to God in Jesus Christ. The devil bids you stay? Yes. The great proof that Christian experience is Divine is that the devil hates it, and shrinks from it. Let a man be thought very godly, let a church be recognised as very spiritual, and the devil will tell the worldling to avoid such a man and such a place. "If you go to hear such a sermon again you will be converted, and then you will be throwing away your life," whispers the devil. Ah! my friends, I speak experimentally, and I bid you hearken to the other whisper of Jesus: "He that loseth his life for My sake shall preserve it." You certainly do throw away your life by coming to Jesus, but it is *the diseased life of self*, and in its place you live the life of joy and

peace, I now live by faith in the Son of God. We are now celebrating the first coming of our Lord, but at His second coming in Judgment where will the ungodly and sinner appear? How shall we escape, if, like the foolish and unprepared virgins, we delay preparation? if, heeding the devil's insinuating sophistries, we neglect so great salvation? I witness that I am speaking the truth to you all to-night, and that a solemn responsibility rests upon every unconverted hearer, for now you will be sinning against the light! Having shown that Jesus is the Christ by many infallible proofs, my last words shall be, "Choose Eternal life, that ye may live!" Amen.

THE *Times* says that Bishop Barry will arrive in England shortly before Easter, the Bishop of Rochester himself not returning till about a month later. The absence of his Diocesan, however, will not be any hindrance to Bishop Barry, for he will, under a special commission, commence his Episcopal duties immediately on his arrival in England.

ON Friday evening, the 4th inst., a farewell service was held at St. John's, Red Lion-square, for the purpose of wishing God-speed to the Bishop of Brisbane, who has been on a visit to this country since April last, and who left for Queensland on Saturday by the *Austral*. Bishop Webber was the founder of St. John's Church and schools twenty-one years ago. In addressing the large congregation assembled, the Bishop said it might interest them to know that the last year's work had seen the opening of thirteen churches in his diocese, or what they called churches out there, but what people in this country might not think much of as churches. They had to be content to use the police-courts and other buildings wherever they found them, but outside the more largely populated districts, they erected these "churches," which were in reality wooden huts. Ten more of these were in course of erection—some were already completed. Fourteen were projected, and many sites were secured for the further buildings. There were sixteen clergymen who would labour there. Seven had gone out, and nine would speedily follow in their wake. In the diocese which was his they had exceedingly few of the aboriginal races, but there were some thousands of Chinese. When he spoke of Mission work he meant that kind of work which took place in the district in 1864, out of which sprang the church they were gathered in; and it would be a neglect of duty not to assist such work in the colonies. As many as 35 per cent. of the emigrants, when they got to their new home, enrolled themselves as belonging to the old mother Church. It became necessary for those at home to realise the necessity of supplying their spiritual wants, and he would suggest that those belonging to St. John's Church should form in their parish an association for intercession, and that the day of meeting should be that of St. Barnabas, so that the news of the colonial Church might be brought more under their view. Prayers were offered up on behalf of the Bishop, and special mention was made of Brisbane in the service, and the hymn, "Jesus shall reign where'er the sun," was sung.

Certain HARNESS' Cure.
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
FOR
LADIES' AILMENTS
Mrs. CRAWSHAW, 3, Princes' Mansions, Victoria Street, S.W., writes:—"*After a fortnight's application of Harness' Electropathic Appliances the effect has been truly marvellous. For eight months my life was a terrible burden. I am now quite well again.*"
Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. **Pamphlet & Advice free on application** to **Mr. C. B. Harness,** *Consulting Electrician,* the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
Only Address,
52, OXFORD ST., LONDON, W. (*Corner of Rathbone Place.*)
Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 19, 1889.

EPISCOPAL AUTOCRACY.

WE think that the Declaration and Counter-declaration, referring to the cases of the Bishops of London and Lincoln, are each of them a mistake. If there is a disputed question of Church law, it remains an open sore until it is decided one way or the other; and nothing can be more unwise than to attempt to prevent it from going before the constituted authorities. As that judicious person, the Town Clerk of Ephesus, said:—"If the Church Association, or any other, have a matter against any man, the law is open, and there are deputies, let them implead one another." The Bishop of London's pretension is, that he has legal power, on his own judgment and authority, to prevent a case going before the courts, and thus to close the law against those who think that either they themselves are personally aggrieved, or that a public wrong has been done. We do not know how the judges may decide the legal question, but we can see that the Bishop's pretension is contrary to public policy, which requires that every supposd wrong, either to an individual or to the public in general, should be brought freely before the courts of justice to be heard and determined. And the ill-feeling, excited by a public hearing of a case of this sort in open court, is an evil by no means so great as the feeling that there exists a wrong, for which there is no legal remedy, and that justice is deliberately refused. In the case of the Bishop of Lincoln, his own personal practice is impugned; and, if we understand him rightly, he claims to place his own interpretation of a certain rubric in the stead of an interpreta-

tion placed upon it by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and to act accordingly. Now, it is of the greatest importance that it should be decided clearly and finally, whether a bishop has the power to do this or not. If he has, then we are under a *régime* of pure episcopal autocracy, from which there is no effectual appeal. Both Bishop Temple and Bishop King have accepted the splendid positions and ample emoluments which they hold on the condition of submitting to the Royal Supremacy, and of admitting that Her Majesty, the Queen, as represented in her Courts of Justice, is over all persons and in all causes, within these her dominions, supreme. That supremacy is the greatest safeguard that the English laity, as well as the clergy, possess against all present and future attempts to exaggerate the episcopal power. There is already a strong tendancy in that direction to be observed in many prelates, of which the mere childish love of personal decoration — the mitres, the copes, the croziers—is only an outward symptom. We have heard ourselves a bishop say—and he neither Bishop Temple nor Bishop King—that he was the one parish priest of his diocese, and all the parochial clergy only his vicars. And the practice of assembling councils, in humble imitation of that at Rome, is already bearing the same fruits it did in the days of Constantine and his successors, encouraging and accustoming prelates to act without the concurrence and support of the churches, of which they are only the principal officials, and thus to assume a practical autocracy. Whatever may be decided, as to the question between the æsthetes of the period and the Second Commandment, which has been raised by the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, or as to the limits that should be imposed upon Bishop King's taste for paraphernalia, it is to be hoped that it will be made clear that an appeal lies from every episcopal decision to a higher Court, and that a bishop's personal conduct must be regulated by the law that is over him, and not by his own individual will, or judgment, or even conscience. The counter-declaration was only following an unwise example. Though, in the first case, speech was anything but silver, in the second silence would have been gold.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Second Sunday after Epiphany.

The opening words of this week's collect bring before us a grand truth; a truth which we ourselves sometimes, and many of our troubled bretheren always, are inclined to call in question. A truth, nevertheless, whose eternal truthfulness is ever a support, the value of which we can never overrate. In these days when everything is questioned; when what used to be thought matters of solid fact become subject to the severest criticism; when household verities became mere matters of conjecture; when all our rock foundations in thought and experience seem about to be proved to be but shifting sand; then it is indeed no small comfort to call to our minds the great truth that the God, whom we call "Our Father," "governs all things in heaven and earth." Yes, "be the people never so impatient," the Lord is King! What though storms rage and mighty convulsions change the whole face of nature, the hand of the Lord is there. And in the yet more mighty human Revolutions, which alter the fates of nations, God overruleth the foolishness of men, and makes evil to be overcome by good. If we look into the world of nature, if we study the science of common things, the greater our knowledge, the firmer and deeper will be our belief in the constant work of a personal loving Creator—a God who watches over the world which He has made, who governs all that He has created. When we consider the wonderful order which prevails, the ceaseless harmonious working of so many different Laws, the Laws so continuously carried out, that the slightest interruption fills us with surprise, and even alarm. When we think of all this, how can we fail to look up to, to reverence the Maker of it all?

Then, again, when we turn from nature to politics, when we see the marvellous way in which prince and peasant, potentate and pauper, have been made to unite in working out the grand schemes of which even the most spiritual, the deepest thinkers of them all were but vaguely conscious. When we see how much man has learnt, how far he has progressed in the art of living, *can* we think such results are due to blind chance, that all has been accomplished without a guiding mind? And then to come nearer home. Can not many of us gratefully say, that for ourselves, in our own individual lives, the Lord has indeed governed all things for us? Often we must confess with shame, "Other lords have had dominion over us"; we have not willingly accepted His rule, yet it was there. And though, perhaps, we have spoilt His gracious plans by our rebellion, He has mercifully conquered and ruled, and we have had the happy result. Let us thank God for this His great goodness, and pray him to grant us for the rest of our days the true peace, which He alone can give. His own blessed Peace, which shall calm and strengthen us amid the strife and turmoil of this world, and which shall be a passport to the glories of that blessed Home, where among the "Many Mansions" is reserved a place for each one, who has faithfully striven to follow the Lord as King and Captain.

IRELAND SINCE THE UNION.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D., Warrenpoint. Author of "Ireland since the Reformation," "The Church of St. Patrick," "The Geraldines," etc.

(*Continued from page* 11.)

CHAPTER XX.

Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland.

The policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland has been one of the most instructive pages in the chequered history of the Papacy. For the first century after the Reformation Roman Catholic

Bishops were rebels, and the friends of rebels. Then, changed circumstances brought a change of policy, and for another hundred years the Roman prelates never ceased to plot, and intrigue, and burrow—dealing, in turn, with all parties—using all kinds of tools, employing all kinds of political means. They blustered and fawned, they cadjoled and threatened, they used or abused their tools, but never gave them their confidence. They have on several occasions crushed the aristocracy of their own communion, and ground them down under the heel of the mob. They did so in 1793, and they have done the same during the recent agitation. They have an interest in the dishonour of England, and they have never once lost sight of that interest during the past three centuries. They gratified one desire of their souls in the overthrow of the Establishment, and in the plunder of the landed proprietors, the majority of whom were Protestants, but they kept out of sight as much as possible, and did not throw off the mask and stand out in bold relief as the patrons of disaffection, until the success of Mr. Parnell led them to believe that the prize was within their reach.

The Church of Rome has been, as a rule in recent times, slow to sanction illegal movements. Her prelates, even in Ireland, were opposed to the young Ireland leaders. Cardinal Cullen denounced Fenianism in 1870. Dr. McCabe and Dr. McCarthy lifted their voices against criminal agitation in 1880. Dr. McCabe condemned the Ladies' Land League in 1881, but the Romish hierarchy changed front in 1882, and threw in their lot with the Nationalist leaders. *The advantages which they expected from Home Rule must have been enormous*, when they risked an alliance with men whom Dr. McCabe thus described in 1881, when Mr. Parnell sought the support of the extreme party in France.

"We should also pray with great fervour for our own dear country. . . . A calamity more terrible and humiliating than any that has yet befallen her seems to threaten our people to-day. Allies for our country in her struggle for justice are sought from the ranks of impious infidels, who have plunged their own unhappy land into misery, who are sworn to destroy the foundation of all religions. Will Catholic Ireland tolerate such an indignity? Will she give her confidence to men who have wickedly planned it? Will she break from all the holy traditions which during ages commanded for her the veneration of the Christian world? Let us pray that God in his mercy may forbid it."

It is instructive to compare this opinion of one prelate with the action of Dr. Croke, who in 1883 started a national testimonial for Mr. Parnell. The Pope issued a pastoral against the fund, but in spite of this opposition it mounted up in a few months to £16,000. In 1885 Dr. Walsh succeeded Dr. McCabe, and his appointment sealed the compact between the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the leaders of the Land League. During that year the Irish Bishops were called to Rome, and Dr. Nulty, one of their number, published a significant letter before he started from Ireland. He said:—"I can find no evidence of a divine providence made to any nation any more than to our own, guaranteeing to it the indefectibility of its faith in all circumstances. Neither can I see any solid grounds for believing in a special exceptional providence which would save Irish multitudes, any more than Irish individuals, from renouncing their allegiance to the Church in a paroxysm of passion, either in retaliation for some imaginary interference with their political freedom, or to avenge an insult or an affront which they had rashly assumed had been offered to them by the Holy See."

Archbishop Walsh rescinded the rule which prevailed in the diocese of Dublin forbidding priests to join in political demonstrations. In 1886 the Plan of Campaign first made its appearance, and "United Ireland" admitted that the idea originated in 1848 with Dr. Croke. It was formally sanctioned by Dr. Walsh, but was declared illegal by the Court of Queen's Bench, December 14th, 1886, and by the Court of Bankruptcy, January 14th, 1887. But Dr. Croke has not stopped at the Plan of Campaign. Here is his letter, subscribing to the Manchester Martyrs' Fund:—

"The Palace, Thurles, April 22nd, 1886.

"Dear Sir,—I enclose a cheque for £5, my subscription towards the Allen, Larkin, and O'Brien Memorial, which I gather from your circular is to be erected in the vicinity of St. John's Cathedral, Limerick. The three Irishmen above named, and now universally known as the 'Manchester Martyrs,' are, I believe, fully entitled to that designation, having been wrongfully arrested, unfairly tried, and barbarously executed for participation in an outrage of which they were not guilty, and murder which they not only did not commit, but could not possibly have contemplated. They went 'like heroes to their doom,' and Ireland does well to perpetuate the memory of their chivalrous bearings on the scaffold, and their unflinching fidelity to faith and country.—I am, dear sir, your faithful servant,

"✠ T. W. CROKE,
"Archbishop of Cashel.

"Mr. C. Johnson, Hon. Secretary."

Irish Times, 26th April, 1886.

Blackwood's Magazine, June, 1888.

Mr. Bagenal says:—"But Dr. Croke has gone still further on the path of revolution. He has publicly blessed the Fenian movement, which for years had been the object of denunciation by Cardinals Cullen and McCabe. He has subscribed money to the fund being raised for Mr. James Stephens, who escaped from Richmond Bridewell. He has also subscribed to what is called the "Manchester Martyrs' Fund." He has recommended and patronised the use of these young Ireland societies, against which we have seen Cardinal Cullen warned the young men of his diocese, and in every possible way the Archbishop of Cashel has done all in his own power to thwart the action of the Government."

We may, perhaps, refer to another and certainly a remarkable illustration of Dr. Croke's idea of the respect due to "the powers that be;" when several of the National League leaders were put on trial for conspiracy in 1887, Dr. Croke wrote the following letter to the *Freeman's Journal*, in response to an appeal on behalf of a Defence Fund. It is a curious specimen of the teaching of a Church that boasts an unalterable and eternal policy, and professes to be a guide in morals:—

"To the Editor of the *Freeman*.

"The Palace, Thurles, Feb. 17th.

"My dear Sir,—I enclose £10 towards the Defence Fund. But when is this style of business going to cease? I opposed the 'No Rent Manifesto' six years ago, because, apart from other reasons, I thought it was inopportune, and not likely to be generally acted on. Had a manifesto against paying taxes been

issued at the time, I should certainly have supported it, *on principle*. I am in precisely the same frame of mind just now.

"Our line of action, as a people, appears to me to be in this respect both suicidal and inconsistent. We pay taxes to a Government that uses them, not for the public good and in accordance with the declared wishes of the taxpayers, but in direct and deliberate opposition to them. We thus supply a stick to beat ourselves. We put a whip into the hands of men who use it to lash and lacerate us. This is suicidal.

"In presence of the actual state of things in Ireland just now, it is inconsistent besides. We run the 'Plan of Campaign' against bad landlords, and stop what they call their rent; and we make no move whatever against the Government that pays 'horse, food, and dragoons,' for protecting them and enforcing their outrageous exactions. Our money goes to fee and feed a gang of needy and voracious lawyers; to purchase bludgeons for policemen, to be used in smashing the skulls of our people; and generally for the support of foreign garrison, or native slaves, who hate and despise the Irish, and every genuine Irishman.

"The policeman is pampered and paid; the patriot is persecuted. Our enforced taxes go to sustain the one—we must further freely tax ourselves to defend the other. How long, I ask, is this to be tolerated?—I remain, my dear sir, your very faithful servant,

"✠ T. W. CROKE,
"Archbishop of Cashel."

CHAPTER XXI.

THE PRIEST IN POLITICS.

THE *Kilkenny Journal*, September 3rd, 1884, reports a meeting at Crosspatrick, in the diocese of Emly. Very Rev. Canon Moore, P.P., presided, and the meeting was attended by a great many priests from the immediate neighbourhood, of whom several were among the speakers. Our present business, however, is with the oration of the Rev. Michael Duggan, C.C., of Gurtnahoe, who was received with loud cheers on rising "to say a few words on land-grabbing and grass-grabbing." We quote the opening portion of his harangue:—

"Evictions and processes of eviction were now the order of the day. Thanks to the Land League, land-grabbing had been put down to a great extent. Public opinion and the spirit of the people are entirely opposed to it; at least, the right-minded and the honest men of Ireland. What was the practice in early days? If one neighbour was breaking down, another neighbour was sure to keep a close eye on him, and he would have a whisper with the bailiff and the agent. It often happened that both the agent and the bailiff were bribed, and a rack-rent was promised to the landlord to evict the tenant and give the farm to his grabbing neighbour. The bailiff, therefore, was the man they had to dread most. It was a common practice long ago to give them presents. He would not recommend any honest, upright man to be a bailiff or a local agent, because the spirit of the times was now such that any honest upright man would not look apathetically, and see his neighbours and his fellow-countrymen down-trodden and walked upon. He could not, of course, recommend them to boycott them, because the Crimes Act was in being now; but he would tell them what they could do. They were not bound to walk with them, or to marry them: but he would tell them that they were bound in charity—to bury them."

Mr. Eyre, a Roman Catholic gentleman, reported this matter to Dr. Croke, and here is the reply of a Christian Bishop. It is dated:—

"The Palace, Thurles,
"January 1st, 1886.

"I have just got your communication, dated 30th December, and really cannot gather from it what precisely you complain of on the part of Rev. M. Duggan, unless, indeed, it be that, in common, as you say, with other speakers at the Crosspatrick meeting, he is alleged to have made some unpleasant remarks about Bailiffs and Emergency men.

"Unfortunately, as you know, bailiffs have never been popular personages in Ireland, and I never heard any one complaining of a speaker at a public meeting because he had denounced them, seeing that it is done every day, both in the press and on the platform.

"Father Duggan made no special reference to your bailiffs, for he knew nothing of them; nor did he mention your name, for he did not know of your existence; and I do not, therefore, see what special *locus standi* you have in this matter."

A leading member of the Irish Parliamentary Party described at a public meeting a circular of the Pope as "an idiotic circular." Yet he was chosen by the Roman Catholic Bishop and priests of County Monaghan to represent that constituency in the Imperial Parliament, and by their influence was elected.

Could those men really have believed the Pope to be Christ's Vicar?

Such are specimens of the policy of Rome in this country at present. At the same time, we must bear in mind that the Irish Roman Catholic gentry stood loyal throughout the agitation, and this fact probably did much to tone down religious rancour, and keep the dispute from drifting into a RELIGIOUS WAR. Professor Maguire and others did not hesitate to oppose the hierarchy of their own Church, and the following extracts from Mr. P. J. Smyth's pamphlet contain opinions very widely held by Irish lay Roman Catholic Unionists:—

"One of the most eminent Catholic divines in Europe, contemplating the spectacle which Ireland presented lately, is reported—and, I believe, correctly—to have said that the Catholic Church had failed as a moral teacher in Ireland. On that point I will not venture to offer an opinion, though I am free to confess it is hard to understand how a people, thoroughly imbued with the principles of Christianity—instructed in its doctrines and well-grounded in the Moral Law—could have fallen in a day from the height of Christianity to the abyss of Paganism—for so swift and abyssmal was the fall. If the clergy had done their duty, how came it to pass that when the lowest instincts of the people were appealed to, and they were tempted like our Lord in the desert, they eagerly embraced the evil, and forgot 'Our Father who art in heaven.'"

And again, the same writer says:—"Land League, National League, Parliamentary Party, Invincible Society, Dynamite, are parts of one great whole. The second is the natural successor, and heir-at-law of the first, and without the occasional active support of the two last, the third would lose much of its efficacy.

The system is one, though multiform in character, and so regarded, it is a repudiation of the Decalogue, an outrage on the fundamental principles of morality, and a negation of the dogmas of Christianity."

"If Christ Himself were to come on this platform, and attempt to oppose the League, He would be hooted," so vociferated an enthusiastic orator at one of the meetings. Where were the priests? They were there, some of them. They heard, and were silent. More than that, by their active aid the blasphemer was raised to the position of a paid Member of Parliament. At all the meetings the priesthood were and continue to be largely represented."*

"But it is matter of sad and humiliating record that the 'No Rent' manifesto was promulgated under the immediate auspices of a priest holding a position of influence and trust near the person of a conspicuous Archbishop. Several priests defended it in speech and writing. Its most violent supporter was a southern curate, and he has lately been promoted to a lucrative parish."

CHAPTER XXII.

The Papal Rescript and its Reception.

We cannot wonder that the Pope determined to examine the Irish question for himself. Accordingly he sent over Monsignor Persico in July, 1887, who visited every diocese in Ireland, and received reports from people of all shades of opinion. The result was the Rescript of April 20, 1888, against boycotting and the Plan of Campaign. "Our Holy Father, Leo XIII., fearing lest in that species of warfare that has been introduced amongst the Irish people into the contests between landlords and tenants, and which is commonly called the Plan of Campaign, and in that kind of social interdict called boycotting, arising from the same contests, the true sense of justice and charity might be perverted, ordered the Supreme Congregation of the Inquisition to submit the matter to serious and careful examination. Hence the following question was proposed to their Eminences the Cardinals of the Congregation: 'Is it permissible in the disputes between landowners and tenants in Ireland to use the means known as the Plan of Campaign and boycotting?'

"After long and mature deliberation, their Eminences unanimously answered in the negative, and the decision was confirmed by the Holy Father on Wednesday, the 18th of the present month."

"The justice of this decision will be readily seen by any one who applies his mind to consider that a rent agreed on by mutual consent cannot, without violation of a contract, be diminished at the mere will of the tenant, especially when there are tribunals appointed for settling such controversies, and reducing unjust rents within the bounds of equity, after taking into account the causes which diminish the value of the land; neither can it be considered permissible that rents be extorted from tenants and deposited in the hands of unknown persons to the detriment of the landowners.

"Finally, it is contrary to justice and charity to persecute by a social interdict those who are satisfied to pay the rents they agreed to, or those who, in the exercise of their right, take vacant farms.

"It will therefore be your lordship's duty prudently but effectually to advise and exhort the clergy and laity not to transgress the bounds of Christian charity and justice whilst they are striving for a remedy for their distressed condition."

(*To be continued.*)

* P. J. Smyth, M.P., "The Priest in Politics." Fourth edition. Dublin: McGee, 1885. Page 7. This pamphlet was published by Mr. Smyth's widow, in accordance with a request made by the writer before his death.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

JOHN x. 16.

Sir,—The right rendering of Scripture, especially in texts so far-reaching as the above, is so important, that it is worth while to correct the curious blunder contained in Mr. Weston's letter by which the error of the Authorised Version, instead of being eliminated, is doubted. The true translation is, of course, the one given in the Revised Version: "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd." Mr. Weston's mistake is that in the first clause he puts flock for fold; in the last, fold for flock, thus inverting the Lord's meaning.

Any modern commentary will tell him that "this fold" means Judaism, and the "other sheep" Christ's people among the Gentiles; and that the great declaration is that all Christ's people, whether Jews or Gentiles, shall under the rule of Himself, the one Shepherd, be united in one *flock*, one Holy Catholic Church; not in one *fold*, or external visible organisation, as the Roman gloss puts it, in defence of the Pope's claim to univesral supremacy.

PRESBYTER.

THE VOICES OF THE PAST.

How sweet are those voices
  Which speak from the past
When the eyes of affection
  Are inwardly cast;
And we see, as in vision,
  The loved and the missed,
The hands that are clasped
  And the lips that we kissed!

How sweet were the voices
  That vibrated thro'
Our spirits, and answers
  Of sympathy drew;
The voice of the friend
  Who once bade us aspire,
And played on our hearts
  E'en as on a sweet lyre,
With the words of true counsel
  To draw us from grief,
As the bud by the sunshine
  Is turned to the leaf!
The voices of children,
  Now children no more,
Pale vision of blossoms
  That fruit never bore.

And often these voices
Will whispering come,
No only when lone,
But mid life's busy hum.
These voices remind us
With pathos how real,
Of those innocent days
When in faith we could kneel,
Ere the cares of the world
Had encumbered our way,
And taught us to stammer
Where once we could pray !

How touching these voices,
How tender, how dear,
How plainly they whisper
True peace is not here !
How fondly they lead us
To visions of peace,
How sweetly they tell us
Life's troubles will cease !

Pay heed to these voices,
The spirit they'd win,
Of syrens the true ones,
From trouble and sin ;
Oh, heed them whenever
They thrill through the breast,
For the voice of the past
Is the wisest and best !

PERCY RUSSELL.

Trent House, Trent Road, S.W.

INFANCY.

A forest in an acorn lies asleep,
And sunrise waits below the morning star
To flood with spreading light the world afar ;
All wisdom in an infant's mind lies deep
Buried and hid, till God, whose angels keep
Charge of the little ones, shall touch and wake
His child to knowledge, life, and power ;—shall make
The seed a fruit for husbandmen to reap.
But what the seed is to the full-grown tree,
Or what the child is to the perfect man,
The same is man to what he yet will be
When Heaven matures the Father's glorious plan ;
His roots are in the past eternity,
His fruit the eternity to come shall see.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

BURIAL REFORM ASSOCIATION AND CREMATION.—The council of the Burial Reform Association held its first monthly meeting this year in the Church House, Westminster, Canon Erskine Clarke in the chair. It was resolved to hold the monthly meetings in the Church House, Westminster, on the second Thursday in every month, at 4 p.m. It was stated that the annual meeting would be in the Mansion House, London, under the presidency of the Lord Mayor of London, on Friday, May 3rd, at 3 p.m., and that the Bishops of London, Bedford, and Lichfield, Gen. the Hon. Alexander Gordon, Lieut.-Gen. Sir G. Willis, K.C.B., the Master of the Charterhouse, and the Rev. W. H. Sewell will attend, unless unavoidably prevented. Stress was laid upon the fact that cremation is quite beyond the province of the society, which was founded for no other reason than that of correcting prevalent burial abuses. Since the beginning of the new year conferences have been held in the Town Halls of Leicester, Northampton, and Leeds, presided over in each case by the Mayor.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allen, Rev. F. E., Vicar of Romford ; Surrogate for the Diocese of St. Albans.
Atlay, Rev. B. T., Vicar of Willesden ; Commissary to the Bishop of Calcutta.
Bennett, Rev. Edmund Thomas, M.A., Curate of Uphill, Weston-super-Mare ; Sole Charge of St. Bartholomew's, Sydenham.
Bigg, Rev. Charles, D.D., Rector of Fenny Compton ; Honorary Canon in Worcester Cathedral.
Codrington, Rev. Robert Henry, D.D., Vicar of Wadhurst, Canon Residentiary of Chichester : Prebendary of Sidlesham in Chichester Cathedral.
Elliot, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Brinsop ; Prebendary of Cublington in Hereford Cathedral.
Graham, Rev. Henry Longueville, B.A., Vicar of Bisley ; Vicar of Ocle Pychard.
Gresswell, Rev. William Henry Parr, M.A., Curate of Aisholt, Bridgwater ; Rector of Dodington.
Guest-Williams, Rev. William Seller, M.A., Vicar of Birtley, Chester-le-Street ; Rector of Redmarshall.
Harpham, Rev. F. R., Incumbent of Shireland, near Alfreton ; Rector of St. John's, Wednesbury.
Hawes, Rev. James, M.A., lately Vicar of Mill Hill, Middlesex ; Rector of Tockenham Week, Wilts.
Hicks, Rev. Edward, M.A., B.C.L., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Sheffield ; Commissary to the Bishop of Caledonia.
Hitchcock, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Vicar of Derry Hill, Wilts ; Rector of Tarrant Gunville, Dorset.
Ingram, Rev. A. F. W., Chaplain to the Bishop of Lichfield ; Curate-in-Charge of the Oxford Mission at the East End.
Kirkby, Rev. Charles William, B.A., Assistant-Organising Secretary of the Additional Curates' Society (Metropolitan District).
McKain, Rev. W. J., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Chichester.
Meres, Rev. Harry John, M.A., Rector of St. Matthias's, Salford ; Rector of the Stowell Memorial Church, Salford.
Morgan, Rev. Evan, Rector of Chelvey.
Morton, Rev. John M., Chaplain to the *Ajax*.
Nevinson, Rev. Thomas Kaye Bonney, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, Rutland.
Penney, Rev. J. W, W., D.C.L., Honorary Curate of St. John's, Glasgow ; Hon. Canon in the Diocese of Argyle.
Percival, Rev. Barwise, Curate of Holy Trinity, Liverpool ; Curate-in-Charge of St. Paul's Mission Church, St. Helens.
Price, Rev. James, Chaplain of the Welsh Church, Manchester.
Reynolds, Rev. Edward, M.A., Vicar of Beighton (Sheffield), Derbyshire ; Rector of Clipston, Northamptonshire.
Rosedale, Rev. Honyel Gough, M.A., Curate of Christ Church, Spitalfields ; Hampton Court Missioner in the East End of London.
Stamper, Rev. William Henry, Curate of Heanor, Derby ; Vicar of Ellenhall.
Stoney, Rev. Robert Baker, Rector of St. John's, Wednesbury ; Incumbent of Shireland, near Alfreton.
Swan, Rev. John Thomas Atkin, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Castle Cary ; Rector of Fiddington.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Babington, Rev. Churchill, D.D., Rector of Cockfield, and Hon. Fellow of St. John's College, formerly Disney Professor of Archæology and Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, at Cockfield Rectory, Suffolk, on the 12th inst., aged 67.
Capes, John Moore. M.A., Ball. Coll., Oxon, at Grove House, Christ Church, Hampstead, on the 14th inst., aged 76.
Carpenter, Rev. George, M.A., at Chadlington, on the 8th inst., aged 60.
Crosse, Rev. Thomas Francis, D.C.L., Canon Residentiary and Precentor of Chichester Cathedral and Rural Dean of Hastings, at Hastings, after a brief illness, on the 8th inst., aged 69.
Davidson, Rev. Arthur Armitstead, M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford, late Rector of St. Lawrence, Norwich, at Ipswich, on the 5th inst., aged 50.
Hayman, Rev. William Edward, Vicar of Tudeley-cum-Capel, at Tudeley Vicarage, Tonbridge, on the 10th inst., aged 66.
Ludlow, Rev. William, M.A., forty-two years Vicar of Kirton, Boston, Prebendary of Kirswell, and British Chaplain at Wildbad, at Nice, on the 6th inst., aged 86.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE BIBLE.

By Rev. Canon LIDDON, D.D.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday, December 9th, 1888.

"I am as glad of Thy word as one that findeth great spoils."—Psalms cxix. 162.

TO-DAY the Church guides us to think of the Bible, and of the Bible as preparing us for the second coming of our Lord. In the Epistle St. Paul teaches the Roman Church that whatsoever had been written in the Jewish Scriptures was written for the learning of Christians, and was especially intended to make them patient and hopeful. And the Collect extends what St. Paul says about the Old Testament to all Holy Scriptures, thus including the New. It leads us to pray that we may so hear, read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest the Scriptures that the object which the Apostle has at heart may be secured, that by patient and comfort of God's Holy Word we may embrace and hold fast the hope of everlasting life.

The passage which is before us takes us back to a date more than six centuries before that of St. Paul, and to a Psalmist, whether he was Ezra or some less known person, who was an exile in Babylon. The burden of his song is the preciousness of the Divine Law, of which it had been for so many centuries the boast and the glory of Israel to know and to guard. Exile as the Psalmist is, he has with him a copy of the Sacred Law, the Five Books of Moses, and it is for him a priceless possession, and enables him to bear with tranquil courage the trials and sufferings of his lot. This exile was probably a poor Jew, sustaining life by a humble trade in the city of the conquerors of his country, and when he walked abroad his eye rested on the vast walls of Babylon, with their circuit of fifty-six miles and their handsome gates of brass; or on the mighty river, flanked on this side and on that by its splendid embankments, or on the royal palace, with its world-famed hanging gardens; or on the temple of Belus, with its square towers rising one above another to an enormous height. And now and then he would wander beyond the city gates, or into some garden within the circuit of the walls, and there by the waters of Babylon he might sit down and weep among a band of fellow-captives whose hearts, like his own, were full of their distant and their desolated home. But everywhere around him throughout the vast empire city were the trophies of victory which the conquering race had gathered from among the peoples, who, generation after generation, had gone down before it. Everywhere he beheld in accumulated splendour the pride of life as Eastern conquerors alone knew how to marshal and to display. And yet, when sated with gazing on this vast hoard of magnificence and wealth, he turned his steps towards his own humble dwelling in some out-of-the-way court or neglected alley of the great city, and on reaching it took out from its wooden case the little, well-thumbed roll of the sacred law, his thoughts glanced back on the site on which his eyes had just rested, and he frankly exclaimed: "I am as glad of Thy word as one that findeth great spoils."

The value and beauty of the Law is the subject of this, the longest of the Psalms. The Law is referred to under many names, as God's truth, His word, His way, His righteousness, His commandment, His testimonies, His precepts, His ceremonies, His statutes, His judgments. It is referred to under one or another of these names in all the 176 verses of the Psalm excepting two. To any one whose heart was not in sympathy with the Psalmist this passive devotion, this reiterated praise of the law might seem monotonous. But, in truth, when we examine it the apparent monotony is almost infinitely varied. To the Psalmist the Law is the Divine Mind and Will clothed in human speech, and he sets no bounds to its usefulness and its value. It is the true guide of man in all ages of his life; but especially if a young man would cleanse his way, it may be by ruling himself after this law, which is God's word. It is, indeed, a counsellor; it is a lamp to the feet; it is a light to the path. It may seem to be of little account amid the godless magnificence of the Pagan city in which the Psalmist lives; but he knows that the world itself only holds on its way through unconscious obedience to its essential principles. "They continue to this day according to Thy ordinance, for all things serve Thee." Already in the Psalmist's eyes Babylon is judged by this sublime and awful law. I am horribly afraid for the ungodly that forsake Thy law." "Thou hast trodden down all them that depart from Thy statutes, for they imagine but deceit. Thou putteth away all the ungodly of the earth like dross; therefore I love Thy testimonies. My flesh trembleth for fear of Thee, and I am afraid of Thy judgments." The Psalmist himself has learned to value it through the sufferings which he has experienced in his captivity. "Before I was troubled I went wrong, but now have I kept Thy word." "I know, Lord, that Thy judgments are right, and that Thy very faithfulness has caused me to be troubled." "Oh, let Thy merciful kindness be my comfort, according unto Thy word unto Thy servant."

But now the knowledge of the Law makes him,

the humble, the depised captive that he is, wiser than those ancient sages of Babylon whose counsels swayed the fate of empires. "I have more understanding than my teachers, for Thy testimonies are my study. I am wiser than the aged, because I keep Thy commandments." So persuaded is the Psalmist of the preciousness of the Law that he will one day proclaim it at the very Court of the Babylonian monarch himself. "I will speak of Thy testimonies also, even before kings, and will not be ashamed." And if this should involve him in fresh trouble, he knows already what is his portion. "My soul is alway in my hand, yet do I not forget Thy law." "Many there are that trouble me and persecute me, yet do I not swerve from Thy testimonies." "Princes have persecuted me without a cause, but my heart standeth in awe of Thy word." Of the preciousness of the Law the Psalmist cannot say too much. "The law of thy mouth is dearer unto me than thousands of gold and silver." "I love Thy commandments above gold and precious stones." "Thy testimonies have I claimed as mine heritage for ever; and why? They are the very joy of my heart." "I am as glad of Thy word as are my Babylonian masters of their ill-gotten gains. I am as glad of Thy word as one that findeth great spoils."

Remark that it was only a small portion of the Old Testament which roused this enthusiasm in the devout Psalmist. It was nothing more than the Five Books of Moses. He was not thinking of the rich experiences, of the histories of the kings, or of the wealth of spiritual force and beauty of the prophets. These were, it is true, for the most part already in existence, but they were not part of the Torah of the Law. For us Christians the later treasures of the Hebrew Scriptures rank as of equal value with those more ancient writings of which the Psalmist sung, and our Bible also contains other writings of yet greater value than any of these—the four sacred records of the words, acts, and sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God manifested in the flesh on this our world; and the precious Epistles, in which His apostles explain and enforce the full meaning of His life, of His teaching, of His death, of His resurrection. Surely we Christians ought to be able to say, with the emphasis of a higher intelligence than that of the exile in Babylon: "I am as glad of Thy word as one that findeth great spoils."

In our day all educated people are pretty well agreed that the Bible is very highly to be prized, if for no other reason yet on account of its unique place in the literature of the ancient world. Certainly, we Christians are not concerned to deny or to ignore the great literary attractions of the Bible, the many points of interest which it presents to the historian, to the poet, to the reasoner, to the man of taste. What poetry in any language surpasses Isaiah's? What political history is more full of incident and suggestiveness than that which we gather from the historians and the prophets of Israel during those years when Palestine was the theatre of the long rivalry between the powers that ruled on the Nile and the powers that ruled on the Euphrates? Who in ancient literature is a more accomplished dialectician than is St. Paul? or who can pass so rapidly as he from logic to pathos, from the sentences which control the understanding to the sentences which touch the heart? Or where in the whole world of letters—even if a man did not, unhappily, believe its truth—where can we discover any narrative of a life that can compare, in point of literary as well as of moral beauty, with that which is given us by the Evangelists? It was not a great divine who, when he was asked what book he would choose, if for the rest of his life he was to be limited to reading only one book, answered that undoubtedly he would choose the Bible.

And yet its literary charms are not the chief or the real reason why we Christians prize the Bible, for the Bible is the book of the human race, and the great majority of the human race, whether from lack of sufficient education, or from other reasons, have no eye for purely literary beauty. Some of the best men that have ever lived have read and re-read Isaiah as if he were merely prose, and they know nothing about the politics of Egypt or Assyria, which so deeply affected the Jewish monarchy, and they do not understand the logic of St. Paul, and if they feel, yet they cannot give a reason for feeling the finished perfection of the Gospel narratives, and yet they are conscious of something in the Bible which warrants them in applying to it that unspeakably sacred term the word of God—something which they find in no other book whatever.

What, then, is the quality in the Bible which marks it off from all other books in the world, from the highest masterpieces of human genius, whether of ancient or of modern days? The answer is, inspiration. St. Paul attributes inspiration to the books of the Old Testament, and with still higher reason the Christian Church attributes inspiration to the books of the New. But what do we mean by inspiration? The word means, generally, inward breathing, that secret operation of the Holy Spirit within the soul of man which by the gift of some clearer light, or of some greater strength than Nature can supply, carries it luminously, impetuously onwards towards truth and goodness. But this general inspiration evidently covers a great deal of ground. On the one hand, we say in the creed, repeating almost exactly St. Peter's words, that the Holy Ghost spake by the prophets; on the other, whenever a sinner is converted to God, it is in obedience to the light and the force of Divine grace. Both are samples of inspiration. What, then, does inspiration mean when we attribute it to the Bible?

Here we are met by a fact, which has been often referred to of late years, that while the Church of Christ has always spoken of the Bible as inspired, she has never attempted to define what inspiration precisely is, and she has been withheld from attempting such a definition by a very good reason —namely, that inspiration is the action of a Being whose movements are necessarily quite beyond us. As our Lord says, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit": we might dare reverently to add, so is every book that is inspired by the Spirit. Clearly we are in presence of an agency the range and methods of which are too much out of our reach to allow us to attempt, at any rate, exact or exhaustive definition; and, therefore, if, for instance, the question be raised whether the Holy inspiring Spirit suggested to the sacred authors not only the subjects about which they should write, but also the exact terms which they should employ, and the style and physignomy of their compositions, it is only prudent to say we do not know. We do not know enough to draw the line with any confidence whatever between what in each author may have belonged to natural disposition, temperament, training, and what may be entirely due to a higher guidance or suggestion.

It may here be rejoined, "What is the good of attributing inspiration to the Bible if you cannot define what you mean by inspiration?" The answer is that we can describe by their effects—by what they imply and by what they exclude—many things which we cannot define—that is, of which we cannot say what they are in themselves. What Locke, the philosopher, calls "simple ideas" are from the nature of the case incapable of being defined; but they are by no means incapable of being sufficiently described to enable us to recognise them at once. It does not by any means follow that inspiration means nothing, or that it means anything that we please, because we cannot give a complete definiton of it. It carries with it plainly some positive advantages and prerogatives which are not to be had, so far as we know, anywhere apart from it, and we may enumerate these without attempting formal definition. If the wind bloweth where it listeth, still we may hear the sound thereof, and thus inspiration means sometimes revelation, the unveiling to a human soul of some truth which could not have been known to it by the light of Nature. The first chapter of St. John's Gospel and the first chapter of the Epistle of the Colossians, to name no others, are inspired in this sense. Sometimes, again, inspiration means spiritual impulse—a movement within the writer's soul which urges him to write, and which guides him to choose certain subjects, or even to embody in his work certain documents which are already in existence. The historical books of the Old Testament generally, and the narrative portions of the Gospels, are in this sense inspired.

But inspiration is not only revelation of hidden truths, not only an impulse to write and a guidance while writing; it is also, in whatever degree, a protection and assistance to the writer against the errors which beset him on this side and on that—a protection which, if it be good for anything, must at least be assured to extend to all matters of faith and morality. To talk about guidance from on high would be misleading if the writer who is so guided is allowed to make mistakes in the very subjects for the purpose of which the guidance is presumably pledged.

Nor is the idea of inspiration by God the Holy Spirit reconcilable with the singular idea which we may encounter nowadays in some quarters, that an inspired book, while containing matter more or less interesting, may yet be somehow fundamentally untrustworthy. This would seem to be a very obvious and unnecessary remark on my part if we were not told that books of the Old Testament, which some critics still describe as in some sense inspired, are really of such a character that we cannot possibly rely on their contents as conveying, I will not say the will of God, but such a true account of human affairs as we should expect in a secular author. Now, take the case of the Book of Daniel. Whether the Book of Daniel was written in the sixth century B.C. or in the second century B.C. may seem to persons who have not looked into the subject a very dry question indeed, interesting only to scholars. Daniel, they may say, whatever his date, is part of the Bible; but in reality upon the settlement of this question depends the further question whether the Book of Daniel is what it plainly claims to be, or whether it is the forgery of a later age, designed to assist the Jews in their resistance to the Pagan king, Antiochus Epiphanes, but wholly untrustworthy as a record of what the prophet whose name it bears really did and said in his lifetime. If this last estimate of the book, which is involved in assigning to it a later date, be a true account of the book, then the book would rank with or beneath those celebrated False Decretals which were written in Northern France in the middle of the ninth century of our era, and in which the Bishops of Rome in the first three centuries were made to use the language and to advance the claims that were natural to the Popes of the early Middle Ages. If this could be proved to be a true account of the book, it would be difficult to maintain the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself as a teacher of religious truth, considering that He largely based His claim to the Messiahship on the great prophecy which the Book of Daniel contains, that he adopted from it the title, Son of Man, that by which He willed to be known among men. If the Book of Daniel be the fiction of a Jewish patriot of the time of Epiphanes, it can no longer be described as inspired, or as the Word of God,

unless these high titles are consistent with a lack of natural veracity which would be fatal to the reputation of works of the most ordinary and mundane pretensions. This is not the time or place to attempt to set forth in detail the arguments based on history and on language, which if we believe that purely predictive prophecy is possible, should oblige us to accept the earlier date. I am only saying that to hold the book to be a low forgery with a political object, and yet to go on talking about its inspiration, is inconsistent and misleading. The property of inspiration attaching to the Bible is felt in its having, from first to last, a constant purpose of leading man to God and to a higher life. This motive is sometimes more, sometimes less, in the foreground, but it runs throughout the sacred volume. It is discernible in the Song of Solomon as in the Book of Exodus; in the Book of Esther as in Isaiah; in the Epistle to Philemon as in the Gospel of St. John—to take the simple out of the dust, to lift the poor out of mire, and to set him with the princes of God's people in the heavenly country. This is its aim—an aim pursued sometimes indirectly, sometimes by precept, sometimes by example, sometimes by pointing to secular records, to heathen histories, to appalling crimes; more often by displaying the Providences of God over men and nations, by disclosing His will, by exhibiting the attractive lives of His servants, and by unveiling the great and precious promises of the life to come.

But in order to discern this, the real object of the Bible, the real drift and meaning of its inspiration we must be in a certain frame of mind, we must have certain dispositions of thought, heart, feeling, will. To those who are without these dispositions, the Bible commonly says nothing more than other books, if, indeed, it does not do us positive harm. It cannot be read profitably by a person who is only interested in its language or in its antiquities, or only in its poetry, or its history, or its logic, just as public prayers and sacraments are worse than useless to those who are only concerned with the aids to worship, with the architecture of the Church, with the music, with the outward order of the service, and without the inward graces of faith, hope, charity towards God and man, and contrition for past sins. If we would come in contact with the inspiration of the Bible, we must, as we read it, be looking out for God, for His truth, for His will, for all that reflects His presence, for all that speaks of Him and for Him. St. Augustine was already looking out for God when the great change in his life was precipitated by a single passage in the Epistle to the Romans: "Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying, but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ"; and the millions who have found in the daily use of Holy Scripture abundant proof of its power, not only to lift them above the passions and errors of a sinful life, but to guide and maintain them at a new and higher level of thought and purpose, afford, in this experience at least, one very striking evidence of its inspiration.

That a great many people in our day are so far from being as glad of God's Word as one that findeth great spoil, that, to speak bluntly, they do not care very much about it, is, I fear, undeniable, and we sometimes hear this accounted for by the remark that the Bible is now too common to be prized as the Law was prized by the Psalmist of the exile. If the Bible is the most precious, it is also in our day and country the cheapest of all books, and men commonly measure books like other things by their value in the market of the world. And the Bible is said to owe some of the neglect which attends it, to the fact that it has been placed within everybody's reach. This reasoning has a certain truth in it, but it is a truth which is discreditable to human nature rather than to the Bible. We think perhaps cheaply of the sunlight because it bathes us in its beauty each day of our lives from morning unto evening; but this does not show that it is the less entitled to our wonder and admiration, but only that our sense of beauty is so feeble and so dull as to require the stimulus of rarity or of novelty. The Bible is neither more nor less inspired to-day, when it can be bought for a few pence, than it was in days when the manuscript of portions of it was paid for by the gold of a comparatively few persons. The real difference is that we are less careful than our forefathers to make the most of it, and it is to this that the Collect draws our attention. Certainly, whenever we attend the service of the Church, the Bible is read to us, whether in the Epistle and Gospel at the celebration of the Holy Communion, or in the First and Second Lessons at the morning and evening service. Do we listen to it with the reverence, the eagerness, the care which is due to a message from on high, or to an account of what has passed on this earth written under higher than earthly guidance? Are those listless, weary, preoccupied faces of men and women, as they too often are, who are hearing, it may be, as this afternoon, the very words of Jesus Christ pleading with the Eternal Father, the faces of Christians who rejoice in the Master's Word as in a treasure of priceless worth? Is there not some reason for fearing, especially in the churches where the service altogether is illustrated by the great and beautiful resources of sacred music, that the lessons are often comparatively unheeded, and that listeners impatiently endure the Word of God itself read at the lectern that they may enjoy the human art which illustrates the Word of God in the canticles or in the anthem? If, as is sometimes the case in a large church, we have difficulty in following the reader of the lessons, we can surely remedy this by bringing with us a pocket Bible or a Church Service and reading for ourselves. In any case,

when the Bible is read in church, a Christian soul should say deliberately to itself: "Now God is speaking, let me try to consider what He will say to me?" But we pray that we may read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest the Bible with definitely spiritual results at home. Such a prayer, my brethern, is scarcely sincere if we make no efforts to act conformably to its drift. Is there not, I ask you, reason to fear that the Bible is less regularly read in private by many Christian nowadays, than used to be the case some years ago? In our busy days people do not allow themselves the necessary half or even quarter of an hour. Business, pleasure, engagements of all kinds, conversation, the newspapers, the monthly periodicals, the novels from the circulating library, devour the time which might be given to the Word of God. Whether we do or not devote a quarter of an hour a day to reading the Bible will not, we perhaps say to ourselves, make much difference at the end of the day, or at the end of a week, but it will have made a great difference at the end of a year. We should be different men according as we have or have not been in spiritual contact with the Word of God for a quarter of an hour each day, during one, and still more during five or ten years.

Nothing will be done unless we have a definite rule to which other things are made to give way. Time can be made if we are resolved to make time by getting up a little earlier, by going to bed a little later, by giving up some less profitable expenditure of the working hours of the day; and whether we follow the daily lessons, reading them over again if, happily, we go to church, that we may make more certain of their meaning, or read through the Bible independently, we ought to have a rule about it. Without a rule the best general resolutions will soon give way to the urgent claims of business or to the seductive demands of pleasure, and they will cease to shape the habits of our lives.

And then we must not merely read, but mark what we read. We may do well to take this word quite literally, and mark with pen or pencil on the margin of the Holy Book, or on the pages of an interleaved copy of it, the passages which at particular times in our lives have spoken most vividly to our souls. But whether we do this or not we do well to remember that the Bible, like nature, like conscience, richly rewards close observation and study. It is not a uniform surface; it is infinitely varied, and the variations present themselves to no two souls in exactly the same way, and to no one soul in exactly the same way at all times of its probation. Like nature, it has many aspects and moods underlying unchanging truths, addressing themselves to varying moods of men with varying effect; and just as spring, and summer, and autumn, and winter, and morning, and evening, and gloom, and sunshine, affect us most variously at different times of our lives: so in the Bible at one time, the histories at another, the doctrinal Epistles at another, the words of the incarnate Son in the Gospels touch us most closely. That it should be so is most natural, since He whose uncreated beauty is veiled by the spangled robe of Nature that meets our eyes is also He who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past to our religious forefathers by the fathers, and has in these last days spoken unto us by His Son. But if we are to understand what the truth of written revelation is, what He says to us at one and what at another time of our lives, how and when He speaks through the familiar words most persuasively, most to our inward spirits, we must mark His utterances as well as read them.

And not merely read and mark, but learn them. It is of no little practical value to have learned by heart large portions of Scripture, and I suppose that many Church people have learned as children and still remember the Epistles and Gospels throughout the year, while some, at any rate, of the Psalms, such as the twenty-fourth or the fifty-first, or the one hundred-and-thirtieth, would be well known by almost all serious Christians; but in ages when the Bible was generally less accessible than now, because it existed only in manuscript, many Christians knew by heart considerable portions of it, such as the whole of the Psalter and several books of the New Testament. Certainly it is better to carry about the inspired words in our memories than to keep them only in a well-bound volume on the shelves of a library—better for us in days of health and strength, but especially better in days of sickness. It is a matter of experience that a patient may be too ill to bear even the sound of another human voice, while yet the understanding is clear and keen and the memory retentive. At such a time how unspeakably welcome are those passages of the Word of God which have been learned by heart in the days of youth and strength, and which now speak to the soul with all the force and meaning of suffering! A servant of Christ who was taken from us not many years ago, who knew by heart most of the Psalms in Hebrew, used to repeat them to himself again and again during his illnesses. "I am never alone," he said, cheerfully, when he was getting better, in reply to an apology for having left him when he was apparently unconscious—"I am never alone; I always have the Psalms; I am constantly learning more and more from them."

And, once more, the Collect prays that we may inwardly digest, as well as read and mark and learn, the Scriptures which are written for us. It is possible to fail in this last and most important point after succeeding tolerably well with the first three. The sacred words, although read and marked and learned by heart, may yet remain as a portion of the body on the surface

of the soul, instead of passing into its system, instead of quickening and clearing faith, of brightening hope, of kindling charity, and adding force to motive, impulse to prayer, varied intelligence to the sense of duty, perfecting everywhere within the soul, the glow and circulation of the Divine life; of thought, feeling, resolve with tints that do not belong to our earthly atmosphere, to our every-day experience. Only after years of intimacy with Scripture, and after many a prayer to Him whose book it is, that He would make its meaning plain to us and its forces operative within our souls, can we hope that this inward assimilation of the fibre of our life to the mind of Scripture has indeed begun. And then how much becomes easy that before was difficult, and how many things plain that had been hitherto obscure!—the secret sense of Scripture underlying the letter which St. Paul sets before us so strikingly in his interpretation of the history of Sarah and Hagar in the Epistle to the Galatians; the anticipations of our Lord in type as well as prophecy throughout the Old Testament; the profound lesson of the Book of Job, that the proportion between the dispensing of good and evil fortune in this life points irresistibly to another; or of Ecclesiastes, which else we might mistake for the despair of some jaded Epicurean, that all that has not God for its object is vanity indeed; or of the Song of Solomon, which, taken in the letter, may read like an oriental love song, but is in reality descriptive of the uncreated Charity in his relation with the Church or with the soul of man; or, again, the winning but awful doctrines of sacramental grace in such chapters as the third or sixth of St. John; the high standard of practice set before us in Paul's Epistles; the warnings, consolations, the terrors, the ecstasies of the Apocalypse. Certain it is that, in view of the future world, there is no book that we should prize so highly as the Bible. It unveils that world, and tell us how to reach it in safety; it does not flatter or spare our faults, but also it does not discourage us. It sets before us the hope which we have in our incarnate, crucified, risen Redeemer. If there were no future, we might possibly dispense with the Bible. As matters are, it is the one book which we cannot afford to dispense with; it is the one authorised guide through life to the eternal home beyond. Well may each of us resolve to-day that we will devote more time and thought and effort to make ourselves at home with it, for it may help us as no other book in the world can do so to pass through things temporal that we finally miss not the things eternal.

THE office of the head of the Oxford House, Bethnal Green, has been conferred on the Rev. A. F. Winnington-Ingram, private chaplin to the Bishop of Lichfield, in succession to the Rev. H. H. Henson, preferred to the living of Barking, Essex. Mr. Winnington-Ingram, who was a Scholar of Keble, took his degree in 1881, and was ordained in 1884.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE,** or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW,** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary, **OBESITY IS CURED,** and will be sent, **gratis and post free,** on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.

(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 26, 1889.

ISLAM, OF THE SWORD.

ONE of the principal services rendered by the great cosmopolitan Missionary Congress, which was held in London, in June, 1888, consisted in the discussions which tended to refute the eulogies of Mahommedanism, lately promulgated by Canon Isaac Taylor and others. The array of facts presented by various gentlemen, long resident in Mahommedan regions, and profoundly acquainted with all the aspects of Islamism, sufficed to demolish the superstructure of theoretic credit, too often ascribed to the influence and operation of the system in question.

Islam is a religion founded upon the sword. By the sword it was first promulgated. By the sword it has maintained its sway; and it is essentially and thoroughly an organisation relying upon force, and on the elements of fear, terror, and absolute submission. But its history, and especially its present condition, decisively demonstrate that it is lacking in those constructive and elevating influences which are so peculiarly and surpassingly characteristic of Christianity.

The following facts, amongst others, were mentioned by the missionaries and travellers who spoke on this question, at the London Congress.

Islam tends to produce Poverty and Pauperism wherever it extends. Witness the existing condition of the Turkish Empire, Morocco, Egypt, and Arabia. In these lands trade is in a mere embryonic state of development compared with other countries. Agriculture utterly languishes. Even the trees are taxed separately. The olive-tree, for example, has a tax placed upon it when

it attains the thickness of a man's finger, and years before it becomes valuable as a fruit-producer. If, in these regions, a man discovers a mine, or valuable mineral lode (and there are many such to be found there) he does not dare develop it, or even, in general, let it become known to the authorities, that such a treasure exists upon his estate. For if he did so, it would lead to his ruin. Such a burden of tribute, or exaction, would be placed upon him, in consequence, that it would be impossible for him to develop the mine to the advantage of himself or the community. Hence the vast mineral resources of Mahommedan regions remain, for the most part, undeveloped. Similarly, as to the construction of Railways, Docks, or Harbours. The authorities either refuse permission altogether for the development of such works, or they impose most unreasonable demands as the price of a concession, or even for the maintenance of a merely passive action on the part of the Government. Hence the backwardness, the half-civilised and wretchedly poor condition of the Moslem Empires. What little trade is permitted is mainly in the hands of foreigners, Jews and Christians, whose nationality and religion exempt them from the control of the Mahommedan authorities. The revenues and resources of the State are kept at an exceedingly low level by the immeasurable stupidity of these Powers. It is only at a few isolated spots, where independent Christian authority prevails as, for example, in the Lebanon, or in certain towns of Palestine, that even a moderate degree of civilisation is secured. Whilst almost every other country of the world has its network of railways, canals, and roads, these are either wholly or largely lacking in Turkey, Asia Minor, Syria, Persia, Arabia, Afghanistan, Beloochistan, and Morocco. It is only during the present year that Constantinople, the capital of the Ottoman Empire, has been touched by a railway.

In Algiers and Tunis, under the French, and in Egypt, under British interference, some social and commercial progress has been secured. But elsewhere, throughout the vast territories of Islam, poverty, beggary and semi-barbarism prevail. Their races have a great gravity of look and expression. They appear wise to superficial observers. But, as nations, they are so ignorant and practically stupid that there are scarcely any schools or colleges amongst them, except those which have been established and maintained by foreign missionaries. There is, indeed, a celebrated College in Cairo. but it forms the notable exception to the general rule of Mahommedan ignorance and indifference to learning. In India, also, the presence of rival races compels the resident Mahommedans to put forth some efforts in the line of education. But even there, they are far behind the Christians and even the Brahmins, in their attainments.

History shows that wherever the Moslem has reigned, he has acted as the thief and squanderer of other people's wealth, and not as a producer of riches for himself or for others. Tennyson and certain writers of poetic fiction have sung of "the golden prime of good Haroun al Raschid," and of the Caliphs of Bagdad and Cordova, in the days of their early conquests and supremacy. Yes, these could, and did, spend very freely and ostentatiously upon themselves the treasures which industrious Christians and Jews had amassed, and of which they had plundered the latter. But when this wealth was exhausted, what followed? Ruin, squalor, and beggary. And these remain, to this day, wherever the Moslem retains his rule. If the traveller walks round Cairo, or Teheran, or other cities of Islam, he sees ruinous structures, and everywhere the signs of neglect and decay, on the part of the rulers of the country.

Sentimentalists may prate about the bold Bedouin and "free Arab of the Desert;" but what is the real condition of these tribes and of their homes? They are like a lot of dirty, squalid gipsies. Their tents are the nests of vermin, where a few cups and pots constitute the furniture. And as a people, they are a set of lying thieves and extortionate beggars. Their women are brought up in degradation and indecency. And it is such females that Mahommedans have for their wives, mothers, and sisters. How essentially degrading, then, is the whole system of polygamous Islam?

The above evils and defects of Islam are but a portion of the intrinsic badness of the fruits of the faith of Mahommed. That faith naturally developes cruelty and vice in its adherents. Mahommed himself, in his later years, became notorious for his murders and unbridled licentiousness. Vices which may not be named in public society still flourish, with special development, amongst the races of Islam. Such, and much more, are the permanent and prevalent fruits of that system which has been founded, propagated, nourished, and characterised by the sword.—*Herald of Peace and International Arbitration.*

THERE is being held this week at Magdalen College, Oxford, an examination for an open Fellowship in Theology. To elect to a fellowship on the result of an examination in theology, is somewhat of a novelty in recent years in Oxford. Probably other fellowships of a similar kind will be offered at other colleges before very long. In the case of many of the colleges, provision was made in the last statutes of the Commissioners that account should be taken in turn in elections to fellowships of all the subjects recognised in the final schools of the University, Oriental studies being alone excepted, as the School of Oriental Languages was not, when the statutes were passed, yet in existence. Theology, consequently, as it is a subject recognised in the final schools, takes its turn along with other branches of learning.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Third Sunday after Epiphany.

"Almighty and Everlasting God!" How much of comfort, strength, and rest is conveyed in those few brief words! *Of comfort*, to those who are well-nigh overwhelmed with the cares and anxieties of this life; *of strength*, to those who, worn out with toil, or depressed by weakness, have been fain to relinquish the struggle, to succumb to the perils of the road; *of rest*, to those who have worked long and faithfully, and, seeing no result, are tempted to become "weary in well doing." To us all, how refreshing and helpful it is to look away from the trials of our few days here, and to meditate on the marvellousness of an Almighty, an Everlasting Defender and Guide. And from the thought of all this wonderful power our minds travel to "our infirmities." We pray that He who *is* able *will*, of His great love, look upon those hindrances, those crippling failings, which prevent us from fulfilling all our mission here. Our infirmities, how many and how various they are! Since the Fall we have always been crippled. The entrance of sin dimmed the brightness of the sun, robbed the flower of its brilliant colouring, gave to the gentle earth thistles and thorns, and robbed man of his perfect likeness to God. Since then man has known the pain of infirmities, the trial of weakness, both moral and physical. There is but one way of recovering our strength; we must apply earnestly to the great Healer, we must go to Him whose manifestation we celebrate. Like the leper and the palsied in the Gospel, we must seek power where alone it can be found—at the hand of Him "who Himself took our infirmities." And let us thank God very sincerely that this is so. Let us never forget that the Intercessor, who pleads ever for us in heaven, is the loving Christ who bore all for us. Our High Priest can be touched with a feeling of our weakness. It was not in vain that the Captain of our Salvation was made perfect through suffering. Then we think of the many dangers which beset our path: dangers from the devil without, from ourselves within. How we need to be on our guard, and to look eagerly for the protection of God's right hand. And let us remember here, that we do not only ask for but that we should *expect* the guidance which we have sought. The devil is ever vigilant; if we take no advantage of our privileges *he will*. "*Necessities*," ah! how much we feel we want! Our needs seem to outweigh all our possessions. Never mind, our God is Almighty, and, more than that, He is all-willing to attend to the cry of the needy. At the same time, we must not forget that His view of *necessities* is the true one. We could not always be trusted to choose for ourselves. "Be ye not anxious." "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings? And not one of them is forgotten before God. Fear not; ye are of more value than many sparrows."

The Bishop of Bedford has, in answer to the appeal recently made to the congregation of Christ Church, Lancaster Gate, on behalf of the East London Church Fund, already received three cheques for £100 each, and other contributions amounting in all to nearly £450, in order to meet the severe strain now put upon this fund by the needs of the Church in Islington, Clerkenwell, and Shoreditch, as well as at the East of London.

IRELAND SINCE THE UNION.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D., Warrenpoint. Author of "Ireland since the Reformation," "The Church of St. Patrick," "The Geraldines," etc.

(*Continued from page* 35.)

CHAPTER XXII.—(*continued*).

The condemnation thus pronounced was positive. It was confirmed by another Rescript still more emphatic, and Irish Romanists may fairly claim that the Head of their Church, in face of terrible opposition, maintained the duties of morality, and upheld the Decalogue; but, on the other hand, this action was a public announcement that for years the hierarchy and priesthood of a whole country had failed in their duty, and this view was put tersely by Mr. John Dillon, a Roman Catholic, at the meeting held in the Phœnix Park on Sunday, May 20, 1888, for the purpose of considering the Papal Rescript. We quote from the *Freeman's Journal*:—"And let him ask them at the outset of the observations which he wished to address to them to consider this question—let him ask them to consider, and it was a grave and serious consideration, the position in which this Rescript had placed the archbishops, the bishops, and the priests of Ireland, who were the men who must answer before the judgment-seat of God for the giving of good counsel and guidance to their people upon all proper questions—the prelates and priests of Ireland to whom had been entrusted as learned and holy men, after the strictest tests and examinations that could possibly be applied to men, the task and the duty of leading their people aright on moral questions, and of applying to the circumstances of each man's conscience the moral law and teaching which was expected to emanate from the Church. That was the duty of the Irish prelates and priests, and what were the people now told by the bitter and unscrupulous enemies of the Church of Christ, of the Roman Church, and of the Irish nation? They were told that the prelates and the priests of Ireland had stood by during two long years, and had given their consent, or had led the people into a wholesale conspiracy of robbery—because that was what the Rescript meant if it meant anything—and that these men, who were responsible, let it be recollected, for their action, had either openly approved of that robbery, or by their silence had tacitly given their consent to it. Well, it seemed to him (Mr. Dillon) that if that Rescript were to be accepted in silence by the people of Ireland, there would be no course left open to nine-tenths of the bishops and nineteen-twentieths of the priests of Ireland but to lay down their croziers, and by retiring from the sacred office admit to the civilised world that they could not claim to guide the people aright. (Cheers.) There was one man, however, who should be excepted. Dr. O'Dwyer, of Limerick, should be made Primate of the Church in Ireland, with a new staff of bishops—(cheers)—for he was the only bishop in Ireland who had stated that the Plan of Campaign was immoral. So much for that aspect of the question."

The condemnation of the policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland contained in these words is all the more emphatic coming from Mr. John Dillon. When an ecclesiastical system adopts the maxim, "Let us do evil that good may come," it is just and right

that its condemnation should be pronounced, and its degradation proclaimed by one of that very party in whose wrong-doing it made itself an accomplice.

But a more instructive fact remains to be noticed. The same man, Mr. John Dillon, having, in defiance of the law of the land and the law of his Church, advocated the Plan of Campaign, was tried, found guilty, and imprisoned in Dundalk Gaol, where the Roman Catholic Primate paid him "a respectful visit." So much for the influence of the Pope in Ireland when it runs counter to the popular current.

At a meeting of the National League on 16th May, 1883, Mr. Mayne, M.P., said :—

"They were on the spot, and they knew the course that was best. They would at the same time pay all becoming deference to the head of their Church. Everything that was due to him Irish Catholics had always willingly and cheerfully paid to the head of the Church, but the head of their political Church was at present Mr. Parnell. *He was their political Pope;* and without lessening the respect, the homage, and the obedience which they owed to their religious Pope, they would follow their political programme under the guidance of whatever man they found most likely to lead them to the goal that they wanted to reach, and must reach."

Mr. Mayne was recommended for the seat of Tipperary by Dr. Croke.

Mr. Davitt, in a letter to the *Freeman*, said that the Pope's circular had been obtained by "our hereditary enemies, the Catholic aristocracy of England." Mr. Healy, M.P., protested against "Italian intrusion in Irish politics"; and Mr. T. D. Sullivan, M.P., wanted to know if it was true that "Cardinal Simeoni had turned emergency man." Such were some of the comments in Ireland.

Since then the Pope himself has entered the lists and given his sanction to the Home Rule movement. What the result may be it is not easy to predict. The stake the Roman priesthood played for must have been high when they go such lengths to gain their point. Again we ask, What was the stake they really played for?

On Sunday, the 23rd of September, at Maryborough, the people of the Queen's County and County Kildare assembled in thousands—all Roman Catholics. Fourteen priests were on the platform, and one of the rev. gentlemen was voted to the chair. Four of "the trusted leaders" were also there, and the originator of the Plan, Mr. O'Brien, was specially honoured. "The hon. gentleman," says the *Freeman's* report, "who has been intimately associated with every development of the struggle on Lord Lansdowne's estate, met with an enthusiastic greeting on arriving on the platform." In the presence of the fourteen priests he advocates the Plan in these words :—

"For nearly two years now they have stood together against all the forces of landlordism, backed by all the bayonets of England (groans), and yet their enemies are further off to-day than ever they were, further off from conquering their efforts or breaking down their combination under the Plan of Campaign. (Applause.) I know nothing like it in the history of Irish combinations. (Hear, hear.)."

But this language, plain as it is, is weak in comparison to the words of Dr. Kenny, M.P., who rejects the authority of the Pope or of any Irish bishop who may presume to support the Pope's authority in Ireland ; and this gentleman is Physician in Ordinary to the College of Maynooth, and has been appointed by the Irish bishops to that position. What could they have thought of the following words—reported in the *Freeman's Journal*, September 24?—

"There is one thing on which, above all others, your county is to be congratulated, and that is Luggacurren. (Cries of 'Bravo.') The splendid manner in which the Lansdowne tenants have sustained their combination is a bright example to the Irish tenants to follow. They have known the efficacy of the Plan of Campaign, which has been and is the salvation of tenantry—their only bulwark and protection against the hand of the evictor. Neither you nor I fear here to-day to speak of the Plan of Campaign, and it would be an evil day for Ireland when men thought it necessary to go about speaking of the Plan of Campaign with bated breath. I say that, no matter whether the condemnation of the Plan of Campaign proceeds from foreign potentate, home bishop, or Coercionist Government, we are determined never to abandon it, or allow it to fall into disuse until it falls into disuse by the triumph of the cause it was invented to protect. (Cheers.) Then, and then only, will the Plan of Campaign become a thing of the past. It is because it has proved to be the salvation of your homes that it is assailed so violently by every weapon of coercion and calumny, and that alone ought to be a convincing proof of its protecting powers. Whenever we see any weapon in the national armoury fiercely attacked by the enemy, be sure it is so simply because of the service it has proved in our cause."

No word of condemnation was uttered by the chairman or his reverend brethren present, therefore one is forced to conclude that they endorse these sentiments.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Quis Separabit.

We might quote cases to almost any extent in which the Roman Catholic priesthood has been identified with the recent troubles of Ireland. The chapel bell has been used again and again to summon whole districts to scenes of riot and tumult ; the altar has been used as the pulpit of a gospel of anarchy, fraud, and disaffection ; the councils of the National League have been "held in no less a place than the holy house of God" ; meetings have been presided over by priests at which the commission of outrages was considered, and resolutions of savage cruelty adopted against those who happened to fall under the ban of the tyrants whose aim was plunder, and whose condemnation often meant death.

And yet, even amid this general degradation of the hierarchy and priesthood of the Roman mission in Ireland, there have not been wanting a few brilliant exceptions when ecclesiastics of that communion dared the insolence of the mob and the violence of a powerful faction, maintaining, in the face of loss and odium, the dictates of honesty and of the moral law. We shall only refer to one instance out of several, viz., the late Father Burke. The following letter is so full of interest that we copy it from "Notes from Ireland," published by the "Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union" :—

THE VOICE OF THE DEAD.

TO THE EDITOR OF "NOTES FROM IRELAND."

November 5th, 1886.

Sir,—I am informed that *United Ireland* denies that Father Burke ever spoke of "the enormous debt

we owe Mr. Parnell for having made us atheists and murderers." I, as the reviewer of his life in the *Spectator*, quoted them from a letter which I subjoin, and which is written by an accurate and trustworthy friend of his and of mine. I know by what I have heard him say myself how truly this reported conversation expressed his opinion of the Parnellite conduct of Irish affairs. Readers of your NOTES, in which these words have appeared, may be interested in further evidence of his disapproval—nay, even detestation—of the Jacobin methods employed to further revolution in Ireland.

"July 8th, 1883.

"My dear ——,

"I can, indeed, give you an accurate account of my last conversation with Father Burke, for it struck me so much that I wrote it down immediately after. It was on the 19th of June that ——— and I went out to Tallaght to see him. The brother who let us in said he was very unwell, and had not got up that morning. But in a few minutes he came down, having got up to see us, and said he had intended to do so. In his kind, paternal way he added, it did him good to do so. The whole conversation, I may say, was about Ireland. He told us when we spoke of rest for him that he was going to preach next Sunday in Dublin for Mrs. Power Lalor's schools in Donegal, and on our speaking of this as almost madness (for he was scarcely able to speak to us, and we knew the agony he would suffer merely from driving into Dublin), and entreating him to desist and spare his life for the sake of us all, I shall never forget the way in which he replied, 'Don't you see that Ireland is such a poor, miserable, destitute country that there is nothing to give to the starving children of the West after we have paid our immense debt to Mr. Parnell"—he stopped a minute—"The enormous debt we have to pay him for having made us atheists and murderers, and then we have nothing left for the poor; so you see if I did not go to preach I should hear the voices of the 5,000 starving children ringing in my ears. I must go if I can.'

"I referred to there having been a collection in the diocese of Southwark for the poor of Donegal, and that it so happened that the last Sunday I spent in England the collection had been in the church I attended; and the next Sunday, in the County Meath, at a village chapel, I was astonished to hear the priest give out from the altar that there would be a collection made in the sacristy after Mass for the 'Parnell Tribute'; on which Father Burke remarked, 'They desecrate the very altars.' And when we referred to the circular from Rome, he said he regretted very much that it had not come long before, 'while undiscovered murder stalked through the land.' He went on: 'I cannot describe to you the intense sensation of relief that came over me the day that I knew that Brady had been hanged. I prayed for the soul of the poor wretch, but we had been living in such an atmosphere of secret murder that it was awful. I can compare the feeling of relief to nothing but the feeling of an Indian village when the news spreads that a man-eating tiger has been destroyed.' The energy with which he said this startled me. He went on to speak of 'the poor misguided people who made of such a man a sort of hero.' He said this in such a way as to give me the impression that his heart was broken with the state of things. He again spoke of the feeling of knowing that there were men abroad to whom nothing was sacred. 'No matter how innocent a man might be, how virtuous, how sacred in his character, or how much esteemed in his life, one of these men would kill him without the slightest hesitation.' He told us afterwards that he himself had received a threatening letter 'on Holy Thursday morning, of all days in the year, glory be to God,' because he had preached the night before in Dublin against murder; on which he remarked, with a touch of his old humour, 'You see one must be punctual with correspondents, and not leave letters unanswered. I answered that letter the same night, and didn't I give it to them!'—he meant in the next sermon. He had preached the Lent sermons at night in Dublin, which were not, as they used formerly to be, reported in the *Freeman's Journal*. He also said: 'At the beginning of the French Revolution, when the other Orders joined the Tiers' Etat, the country priests were received with unbounded exclamations of joy; these priests were all guillotined afterwards.' He did not make the application, for it was not needed. What passed indeed can hardly be called a conversation. We hung on his words, fearful of interrupting him, and fearful each moment that he would have to stop. At length the doctor was announced, and we had to go away. I wish these dying words of Father Burke's could be known just on account of their strength. They come from a man of unbounded charity, as his death showed—the consequence of that charity sermon for the Donegal children at the close of a life in which he had spent himself for Ireland.

"I have the honour to remain, Sir,

"Your obedient Servant,

"THE WRITER OF THE REVIEW OF FATHER "BURKE'S LIFE IN THE 'SPECTATOR.'"

(*To be continued.*)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE *EIRENIKON.*

SIR,—Referring to the letter of "A Member of the Dublin Diocesan Synod" in the PULPIT of last week, will you allow me to say that my statement respecting the Ritualistic Guild in Trinity College, Dublin, made in your columns about six months ago, is entirely correct, and was never contradicted. That statement was, that there was no society or guild of the kind described, of such a nature as that the college authorities could take any notice of it. The most recent information which I have of the knot or clique of Trinity College ritualists, confessionalists, and celibates is, that it consists of two, one of whom is about to be married.

The fact is, that sound Church principles are on the advance in this country. Some extreme self-entitled "Protestants" (as if we are not all Protestants), disapproving Church principles, have selected for attack this pitiful mare's nest. If your correspondent is right, that there was no exposure at the Dublin Synod by the Archbishop of the misstatements of the pamphlet under discussion, then the Archbishop was misreported in the newspapers.

Your readers are told that they may make up their minds which of the two, Dr. Wright or myself, is

correct in *their* statements. Dr. Wright's speech consisted chiefly of extracts from the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, and he made no statements that are inconsistent with mine. The victory which "The Protestant party" gained in the debate was such a victory as the Land Leaguers are every day boasting of gaining over the law and the Government.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

January 19th, 1889.

ATHANASIAN CREED.

SIR,—I see in the sermon by Canon Curteis in your issue of January 12th the words, "they both" (the Christian and the Agnostic) "have come to rest, rather wearily, in the decision of all the great Fathers of the Church, and *in the dogmatic statement of the Athanasian Creed*, that *God is*, by man's intellect, *incomprehensible*."

The context of the words, as well as the words themselves, shows that the Canon must have understood the word *incomprehensible* in the sense in which it is now usually taken in modern English, but in which it was certainly not used by the translators of the Creed to convey the meaning of the Latin, *immensus* (ot measurable).

Such a mistake is a good reason for revising the translation of the Creed, as was proposed at the Lambeth Conference, and left to the discretion of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

C. P. M.

January 17th.

THE BLACK RUBRIC.

SIR,—"When we have stormed the Malakoff the Redan will give us little trouble."—(Foolish talk before Sebastopol.) We all know how this was fulfilled. The same foolish talk goes on now among some of the writers in our Church papers. Their talk is, when we have broken through the Black Rubric, the 4th Article can oppose no resistance. Such are the hopes of the allied forces of Rome and the Ritualists, led by Marshall Littledale and his assistants. It shall now be my business to show the invincible strength of our two forts, the Malakoff and the Redan.

1. The Black Rubric is plain enough. There is no corporal presence; our Lord's Body is a natural body; it cannot be locally and materially in more than one place at a time; we cannot worship either the bread or a material body as grossly present, which is confined to heaven alone. This position is so strong that it might affright all its assailants. But the foe thinks by sapping or escalade to force his way through it. How is this to be done? The language, he says, was so altered in 1662, that now "it virtually enjoins the adoration," which it seems to condemn. This is strange! a condemnation might be altered, might be weakened, but that it should virtually enjoin what it originally condemned—and now seems still to condemn—this is strange indeed!

2. No doubt there was a change of language. That the sense was not changed it will be my business to show. The Black Rubric of 1552 denied a "real and essential" presence, the Black Rubric of 1662 denies a "corporal" presence only. But "real and essential" of 1552 meant "corporal," for in the Article of the same date the words are "real and bodily," which, of course, is the same as "corporal." In 1552 "real" meant corporal; but, by 1662, it came to mean only the opposite of imaginary. Therefore, lest the Black Rubric should seem to deny a real presence of virtue and grace, held by Cosin and other of the Savoy Conference, the word "corporal" was substituted, the meaning being precisely the same. But, even supposing that red did not mean exactly the same in 1552 that corporal did in 1662, it was an extraordinary freak of fancy in any one to give utterance to, that this change "virtually enjoins," what before it condemned. Besides we are told that the bishops had scruples about re-admitting the Black Rubric in 1662. This is not the fact, except that they thought it unnecessary (see Cardwell), as a corporal presence and adoration were sufficiently guarded against by the Articles 4 and 28. But surely, if, as is insinuated, the Savoy Conference favored adoration of a local presence, and if the altered Black Rubric "virtually enjoins" it, it is absurd to say that they were unwilling to sanction its doctrine. The story or figment does not hang well together.

3. But now we turn from our Malakoff to our Redan, the 4th Article. This, a wiseacre in the "Church Review" of the 4th inst., says, is "not at all to the point." I will now show that it is so much to the point, that it is sufficient to protect us against Rome and the Ritualists, even if we had lost the Black Rubric out of the Prayer Book. Let us look at the language of the 4th Article, "Christ took again His Body, with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature," this He now retains till He returns again. Does not being confined to one place appertain to the perfection of man's nature? If not, how defend a man by an *alibi?* This is our Redan: so far from not being to the point, as to confining our Lord's Body locally to heaven, it is so much to the point, that it can save us from "Ritualistic" divinity, even if the Black Rubric were gone. Our Malakoff is impregnable; but so is our Redan, the nonsense that is talked in the English papers about a body not being in space, about our Lord's Deity not accompanying His body when on earth, about our Lord's gross body, supposed in the Wafer, not moving, is all the greatest mass of meaningless verbiage—intended to make all dark, that no one may see—the greatest rubbish that it is possible to conceive.

C.C., V.G.

THE annual dinner of Old Oakhamists was held at the Holborn Restaurant on the 22nd inst. The Bishop of Hereford presided, and was supported by Archdeacon Cheetham, Rev. Thomas Peak, Frederick Haigh, Esq., Rev. Vere Hodge, Dr. Gibbon, and many other old boys. The Bishop of Hereford, speaking in reply to his health, remembered the excellent work done by the school in his time, and referred to the customs of the schools, and to the large number of eminent men who were educated at Oakham under Dr. Doncaster.

CANON GOODWYN, vicar of St. Andrew's, Sharrow, Sheffield, has accepted the rectory of Rotherfield, near Tunbridge Wells. Formerly Rotherfield was the richest parish in the county of Sussex, but portions of its income have gone to augment the endowments of neighbouring parishes. In Sheffield the news of Mr. Goodwyn's removal has been received with great regret. He was offered two or three years ago the Bishopric of Bathurst, New South Wales, which he

conditionally accepted, but afterwards he withdrew his acceptance. Mr. Goodwyn, who was made a Canon of York a few months ago, married the eldest daughter of the Archbishop of York.

THERE are two Professorships of importance to be filled up in the course of the present term at Oxford—the Laudian Professorship of Arabic, vacant by the death of Professor Gandell; and the Wykeham Professorship of Logic, vacant by the resignation of the President of Corpus. The notice of the electors to the first of them, which has just appeared, announces that "the Laudian Professor of Arabic is required by statute to lecture and to give instruction on the Arabic, Syriac, and Chaldee languages and literature; that the present stipend of the Professor is made up to £300 per annum; that he will at a future time receive the emoluments to be provided under the statutes of St. John's College. The notice of the election to the Chair of Logic has not yet been issued, but it is expected to appear shortly.

THE *East London Church Chronicle* contains a New Year's greeting from the Bishop of Bedford (Dr. Billing) and a list of grants made from the East London Church Fund to twenty-eight parishes in the Islington, St. Sepulchre, and Shoreditch Deaneries, £2,000 having been already voted in grants to the new district. There was an increase in the income of the fund last year, the total being £13,578, which was the largest answer ever given in one year to Bishop Walsham How's original request for £15,000 a year, the increase being £882. It is stated that no greater compliment could have been paid to the fund by the Bishop of the diocese than the addition to their district of 700,000 souls in destitute places, and to meet these increased responsibilities at least £20,000 would be needed this year. A picture of the new Mission Church of Holy Trinity, Shoreditch, and also a rough sketch of two of the squalid homes by which it is surrounded, are among the illustrations, and it is stated that the Bishop of Bedford and his council have just made a grant for a Mission-woman for this most poor and difficult parish, in addition to the grant already made towards the curate's stipend.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barnes, Rev. Jocelyn, M.A., Rector of North Huish, Ivybridge; Vicar of St. Breage-cum-St. Germoe, Penzance.

Barrett, Rev. Tufnell Cowper Alliston, M.A., Curate of St. John-the-Divine, Kennington; Rector of Newbold-with-Dunstan, Derbyshire.

Beck, Rev. William, Rector of Claunaborough; Chaplain to the Crediton Workhouse.

Bennett, Rev. Edmund Thomas, M.A., Curate of St. Bartholomew's, Sydenham.

Blomefield, Rev. George Pinchin Allan, M.A., Vicar of Camrose, Haverfordwest; Perpetual Curate of Bulkworthy.

Bolton, Rev. Richard Knott, M.A., Rector of Newbold-with-Dunstan, Chesterfield; Rector of Fenny Bentley, Derbyshire.

Buswell, Rev. William, B.A., Rector of Widford, Chelmsford; Rector of Smeeton Westerby.

Carr, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Vicar of Kimberworth, Rotherham; Vicar of Goole.

Chapman. Rev. Theodore, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Lowestoft; Vicar of Jesmond, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Colman, Rev. Ernest Francis Paget, M.A., Curate of Alderney; Rector of La Foret, Guernsey.

Dalton, Rev. Wiliam Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. Jude's, Upper Chelsea; Vicar or Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Stowupland, Suffolk.

Davies, Rev. Zacchæus Meyrick, B.A., Curate of Pentrebach, Merthyr; Perpetual Curate of Blaenpemal, Cardiganshire.

Drummond, Rev. John Adolphus, Curate of Warrington; Curate-in-Charge of St. Thomns's, Stockton Heath, Cheshire.

Dunn, Rev. Ronald, Vicar of Bruera, Chester; Chaplain of Saighton Towers Private Chapel, Chester.

Fowle, Rev. E., licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.

Goodwyn, Rev. Canon Frederick Wildman, M.A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Sharrow, Sheffield; Rector of Rotherfield, Tunbridge Wells.

Grane, Rev. William Leighton, M.A., Rector of St. Thomas à Becket, Cliffe, Lewes; Rector of Bexhill.

Grier, Rev. Alfred, Curate of Thornton Hough, Neston; Curate-in-Charge of Frodsham.

Harford-Battersby, Rev. John, M.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Onslow Square; Vicar of Pembury, Kent.

Job, Rev. Fred. William, Junior Incumbent of St. Paul's, Liverpool; Vicar of Lyneal-with-Colemere, Ellesmere, Salop.

Jones, Rev. Richard Henry, B.A., Vicar of Wiston, Haverfordwest; Vicar of Clarbeston, Pembrokeshire, also by dispensation.

Jones, Rev. T., Chaplain to the Troops at South Hook Fort, Herbranston.

McLaughlin, Rev. Alfred Harry, B.A., Curate of Kilndown, Staplehurst; Vicar of Bothamstall, Notts.

Mitchell, Rev. St. John Fancourt, M.A., Chaplain at Calais.

Morris, Rev. Rupert Hugh, D.D., Chaplain of the Private Chapel at Eaton Hall.

Norcock, Rev. Edward Henry George, M.A., Vicar of Sapiston, Bury St. Edmund's; Perpetual Curate of Brixton.

Pelly, Rev. Richard Arnold, M.A., Vicar of Cold Harbour, Dorking; Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Stratford.

Reeve, Rev. Edward John, Vicar of Fleetwood; Acting-Chaplain to the Forces.

Robinson, Rev. Henry Wilson, Curate of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, London; Vicar of Isleham.

Romanis, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Wigston Magna; Vicar of Twyford.

Serle, Rev. Samuel Thomas, Curate of Parkham, Bideford; Rector of Sowton.

Simpson, Rev. George T., Curate of Atherstone; Vicar of Wolfhamcote, Rugby.

Spicer, Rev. George Waters, Curate of Batheaston; Sole Charge of Northmoor Green.

Stokes, Rev. Henry Pelham, M.A., Vicar of Isleworth; Chaplain of Brentford Union Schools.

Stooks, Rev. Charles Drummond, M.A., Vicar of Yateley; Perpetual Curate of St. Andrew's, Minley.

Strachan, Rev. Thomas Maire, B.A., General License in the Diocese of Peterborough.

Vyvyan, Rev. Henry, Rector of St. Mary's Castlegate, York; Chaplain to York Prison.

Walker, Rev. John William, M.A., Vicar of Saxthorpe, Norfolk.

Warleigh, Rev. F. L., Chaplain to the *Duncan*; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Champion*.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Adams, Rev. George Dacres, eldest surviving son of the late General Sir G. P. Adams, K.C.H., Colonel of the Inniskilling Dragoons, at Dawlish, on the 12th inst., aged 65.

Arkwright, Rev. Henry, at Bodenham Vicarage, on the 13th inst., aged 77.

Fowler, Rev. Robert, Curate, third son of the late Joseph Fowler, of Winterton, Lincolnshire, at Beaconsfield, Bucks, on the 17th inst., aged 52,

Grant, Rev. Henry Carmichael, Priest, M.A., for nearly twenty years Rector of Chilbolton, at Chilbolton Rectory, on the 14th inst., aged 51.

Hunt, Rev. William, Prebendary of Wells, and late Vicar of Holy Trinity Church, Weston-super-Mare, at Weston-super-Mare, on the 14th inst., aged 81.

Nadin, Rev. Joseph, for thirty years Vicar of Crewe, on the 18th inst., aged 63.

Stock, Rev. John, M.A., for thirty-eight years Incumbent and Vicar of St. George's Parish, Chorley, Lancashire, on the 18th inst., in the 71st year of his age.

Wright, Rev. James Camper, M.A., Rector of Walkern, late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, on the 6th inst., aged 62.

The Church of England Pulpit.

REVELATION AND SCIENCE.

By the Rev. Prebendary BASSETT, M.A., Vicar.

A Sermon Preached in Dulverton Church on January 6th, 1889.

"Where is He that is born King of the Jews? For we have seen His star in the east, and are come to worship Him."—Matt. ii. 2.

WHEN any particular boon or blessing is withheld from us, it is in the nature of man to long for its attainment; and if, as time goes on, it is still denied us, we are apt to murmur against Providence, as though we had a prescriptive claim to the object of our desires. But, suppose it is granted, we soon become accustomed to its possession and enjoyment; the days of asking, seeking, and knocking are forgotten; the fact that it was a gift sinks into oblivion; our possession of the treasure is looked upon as a right. If we add to this that the benefit in question is not only one that concerns the individual, but also a body corporate, a family, a nation, or a Church; as the early generations, who first came in for the inheritance, pass away, the succeeding ones are less keenly alive to their privileges, till at length they learn to disregard them, and alas! some sink into deeper gulfs of ingratitude; they learn to ignore, to refuse, to reject the very blessings for which their ancestors longed, and laboured, and sought with many a prayer, and received with praise and thanksgiving. Perhaps there is no doctrine to which these thoughts may be applied with more truth than to that which we commemorate this day, the Epiphany, or Manifestation, or showing forth of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles. Originally, to the Jews alone pertained the revelation of God, the adoption to be His children, the giving of the Law for their guidance, the promises of a Messiah and Redeemer to come, the presence of His glory, and the service of God; in a word, all that constituted Israel to be a religious and an enlightened people. "God did not do so with any other nation, neither had the heathen knowledge of His laws."

But at length, at the coming of the Lord, the doors of the spiritual temple were thrown open, the vail that concealed His presence was rent, the close-fastened bars of the covenant were drawn back; and oh! with what joy did the Gentiles welcome the glad tidings of salvation. Read the tenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles; as we scan the page, the artistic skill of the graphic writer, St. Luke, almost renders visible to us through the vista of the ages, the glowing, holy-happy faces of Cornelius and his friends, as he detailed the features of his own vision and listened to the corresponding revelation that had been made to St. Peter; with what heavenly joy do the words burst from his lips: "Now are we all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God."

The Epiphany cast a ray of light that lingered long in the early Church. Epiphany was with the Churches of Gentile origin a great feast in primitive times; but ere long the mystery that the Gentiles should be coheirs and of the same body in Christ through the Gospel became an habituated thought, and a natural and necessary right; then the claims of the ancient possessors were ignored, the engrafted branches boasted against the natural ones; and, alas! how many since then, and how many, especially in these latter days, have come to disregard the worth of their adoption, to discard the inestimable riches of Christ, and are even busied in seeking to minimise their value, and to defraud others of the wealth of their high and heavenly calling. Nevertheless, we this day celebrate the precious truth that Jesus died "not for the nation" of Israel only, "but also that He might gather together in one the children of God that are scattered abroad." We call to mind the effect of the last command: "Go ye into all the world, and make disciples of all the nations." We unfold the mystery that the middle wall of partition is broken down, and that Jew and Gentile are one in the Church of God.

I. The gospel for the day narrates the visit of the wise men or Magi. These men were really the first-fruits of the great harvest of heathendom, the advance-guard of the multitude, which no man can number, out of every nation and people, and tribe and tongue. It was on their eyes that the first gleam fell of that light of the Gentiles for the removing of the vail that was spread over all nations. They were members of a school, college, or guild of philosophers or scientists that had existed from very ancient times. Among other subjects that engrossed their minds astronomy held a foremost place. The majesty and marvels of the heavenly bodies arrested their attention, and the clear atmosphere of the eastern clime facilitated their observations. There are not wanting hints in Scripture, and there is Oriental tradition to corroborate the same, that Abraham himself in Ur of the Chaldees was a student of the stars; and Balaam, who probably was a member of such a company, has left it on record for those that should be initiated in succeeding generations into the mysteries of the Magians that "a star should come out of Jacob" (Numb. xxiv. 17). This prophecy and the

purport of the oracle were doubtless handed down by tradition, and treasured up in the hearts of the thoughtful, so that when the "wise men" saw a strange and unknown light kindled in the skies, the remembrance of the prediction, like a reflection from that light, flashed across their minds, and coupling together the witness of the word and the witness of the star, they came to the conclusion that the fulness of the time was come, and that the promised Redeemer was born to reign over the house of Jacob for ever. Thus, the two motive causes for their undertaking so long and laborious a journey were the revelation they had received through their predecessors, and the sight of the luminary they had discovered in their observation of the heavenly bodies; in other words, as we may put it, Scripture and Science were the teachers and guides that pointed and prompted the way in which they should go.

II. Let us look more closely at these motives. It was by Revelation, in some form or other, that the Magi must have derived their knowledge that some Great One should be born, and that He should be the King of the Jews, and that He should be worthy of their gifts, and of their adoration. It may be that the chief source of their information was the ancient prophecy of Balaam, or some other tradition might have gained currency among these seekers after truth, or it is not impossible that they had gained some access to the contents of the Hebrew Scriptures, or from having intercourse with members of the house of Israel they may have learnt to embrace their doctrines and espouse their creed. We cannot decide with certainty through what channel the truth had penetrated to their minds, but whatever was the mode in which it was revealed to them, the source from which it sprung is evident and indisputable,—it must have come eventually from the revelation of God, and was conveyed to them either orally or by writing from those to whom it was originally imparted.

We now turn to the object in the heavens, which their scientific pursuits brought before the notice of the Magi. We have said that astronomy formed an important branch of their studies. It is said that they saw a star, which was evidently a novel sight, and one which their science could not account for. Here let me remind you that in reading Holy Scripture you will always find natural facts stated and described as they presented themselves to the senses of those that beheld or witnessed them; and this is based upon the highest wisdom. It is, comparatively speaking, but recently that the laws which govern the machinery of the universe have been discovered. If Scripture had used the language which was mathematically and scientifically exact, all previous generations for whose moral good, as well as for our own, these Scriptures were penned and preserved, would have utterly misunderstood their meaning, whereas by using terms and modes of expression which correspond with the facts as as they present themselves to our senses, all generations, and all classes and conditions of men, learned and unlearned, are alike edified and satisfied. Now, our text tells us that the "wise men" saw a star—a star! What did they see? It could not be a fixed star, whose distance we now know to be measured not by millions but by billions of miles; neither could it be a comet which had beaten its way from distant spheres, nor could it even be a planet—a sister world—in the same system as our own, for none of these could be a guide from the East to Jerusalem, and then, as it were, turn a corner and move on almost at a right angle to its former course; neither could any of these heavenly bodies so stand over a particular house, as to distinguish it from others, and identify it as the place where the Lord lay. Some modern commentators have advanced the theory that this star was the result of a conjunction of the two largest planets in the solar system; but it has been proved that though they came apparently near each other about that time, they were not near enough to form a coalition and exhibit the appearance of a single and solitary luminary. Neither, as we have said, could planets, whether separate or combined, fulfil the conditions described in the sacred narrative. What, then, did the Magi see? When the Lord appeared to Moses on Mount Horeb, and sent him on his mission to redeem the children of Israel from Egypt, he appeared in a flame of fire in the Bush. That glory was the vestment and token of Deity, which rendered His presence recognisable to the eyes of man. The same glory assumed the pillar of cloud as an envelope, and marched before the hosts of Israel in the wilderness; the same glory rested on the mercy seat in the Holy of Holies in the Tabernacle and the Temple. The same glory appeared to the shepherds as they kept watch over their flocks by night in the fields of Bethlehem; the same glory was manifested on the Mount of Transfiguration, and the same glory will be revealed at the Judgment of the Great Day. This same glory was the star, so called from its similitude to the lights of heaven, the Shekinah, or habitation of God, the fire-tent of His indwelling, that visited the realm of our atmosphere, and preceded the Magi, as in days of old it had marched before the Israelites, and was a lamp to their feet and a lantern to their path till, like as that same pillar settled down upon the tabernacle in the wilderness, so this "star" rested over and lighted up the sacred spot where lay the child that was the true antitype of that "tent of God," for "the Word was made flesh and tabernacled in us, and we beheld His glory as being that of the only begotten from the Father." Thus the word that they believed, and the star that they saw—in other words, Scripture and Science—combined in

guiding the Magi to the presence of the new-born King.

III. In these days, in which our lot is cast, much has been said and written on the union or severance of Science and Scripture. It is said that the special advocates of each of these branches of knowledge labour under mutual disadvantage; the students of Science are seldom students of Scripture, and the students of Scripture are seldom Scientists. The former assertion is not unfrequently true, but the latter is open to considerable modification, as some of our most gifted men in various branches of scientific research have been both members and ministers of the Church of our country, though perhaps it may be admitted that, in some cases, their science was a stronger subject with them than their theology. But what do we mean by science and scientific discovery? Is there not a frequent confusion in men's minds between the finding out of a fact and the making of a fact? People so often speak of some new discovery as though the thing discovered was then made or created, and that, too, almost by the talents of the inventor, instead of being regarded as a secret long ago existing, though concealed, and now brought to light. The laws, for instance, of stellar and planetary bodies have existed and ruled from the furthermost depths of the ages; and the discovery of those laws is only the finding out of the fact, not the making of it. The same may be said of the study of the earth on which we live and move and have our being; all the wonders that have been evolved by the examination of the strata that with their warp and woof have woven the vestment that surrounds the globe were not created by their discovery, but discovered because they were created. It is often charged against the theologian that he changes the interpretation of the Scriptures as new disclosures are made by science. True; but are not the two cases parallel? The man of science has at the commencement of his studies accepted certain facts or theories with reference to the laws or elements of matter; a new theory is advanced, it is analysed, tested, and found to be a fact; does he not in consequence alter, modify, or even cancel his former opinions? Yet the laws themselves that govern matter are the same, and the matter itself is, and has been, the same from the beginning, unchanged and unchangeable. So the Word of God is and remains the same from the day that its various oracles were revealed and registered, but fresh discoveries are made as time goes on, and old interpretations or translations are found to be imperfect or erroneous, and new ones take their place, yet the original text is subject to no alteration; the truth was there from the beginning, but it had not been unsealed and divulged; the glory was there, but the cloud had not gone up.

As then Science and Scripture have so sisterly a relation to each other, we naturally seek to learn the special province and department of each; how each in fulfilling her own mission mutually enhances her sister's charms, like twin stars, which, though separate, yet combine to make one common and resultant light. By science we learn the laws which govern the material creation. By its aid we trace design in the height above and the depth beneath. Adaptability of means to the end confronts us at every turn; the balance and counterbalance of gigantic orbs and infinite constellations are not more marvellous than the instincts that guide the microscopic insect to secure its self-preservation and its reproduction. How wonderful are the intricate mysteries of our own being—the automatous processes by which our life is sustained—so perfect in their separate and corporate action, yet exercised without our will and against our will; and yet this complicated mechanism is our very self, and yet unknown to self; all this multiform and varied design above us, beneath us, around us, and in us, proves to the unbiassed mind the truth of St. Paul's argument that the eternal power and divinity of God are clearly seen from the creation of the world (Rom. i. 20). From Nature we may learn Nature's God, and as fresh marvels are disclosed, and mysteries laid bare, by the researches of science, which are only the finding out of the works of God, our conception of the Omnipotence of the Great Maker of all things is correspondingly increased. But when we have granted this to science we have granted all. She comes forth from her laboratory and tells us there is a Designer, an Architect, and a Creator of the Universe, but having uttered this voice, she closes the book and binds up her testimony. Then Scripture comes forward and takes up the thread to supplement her sister's record. She tells us that that Creator of all things is our Father in heaven, who not only made us and breathed into our nostrils the breath of life, but who so loved us that, after we had fallen away from Him, He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life; that the Son of God, the very Wisdom and Word of the Father became incarnate, and offered Himself as a sacrifice for our sins, and that the co-eternal Spirit regenerates, calls, converts, sanctifies, guides, stablishes, strengthens and settles each adopted child of God, and perfects him to life eternal. Now these two, Science and Scripture, have each produced her book, and lo! the books are rather two volumes of one book, the one the complement of the other, each the interpreter or necessary index to the other. We have called them sister-witnesses of God; perhaps we might have chosen a better figure, and likened them to a pair whom God hath united in indissoluble matrimony, and warned man, who in these last days would bring them into the divorce court of so-called criticism, and

sever the tie, "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder."

IV. But we must return to the "wise men." They coupled together the revelation they had received, and the scientific observation they had made of the star that appeared. They put the two testimonies together. Scripture and science, so to speak, were two witnesses in the same court, that came forward to present a joint-testimony to one and the same truth, they did not in the judgment of the "wise men" contradict, but completed each other. And what was the result? they came to worship Him. Oh! how different are the Magi of our day. Such an one conceives a theory; he calls it a discovery, which is often a misnomer, he has found out what appears to him a fact, which is not in accordance with some supposed enunciation in the Bible. What does he do? He does not stop to examine by the aid of those who are qualified to help him, whether the translation of the special portion of the word impugned is correct or capable of a different exposition, but frequently in ignorance of the language in which the Scripture was written, and relying on a popular and fallacious interpretation, he rushes into print in some well-known periodical, or he inaugurates a series of lectures, and he asserts that he has made a discovery which shows that the sacred text is untrue, and therefore unreliable, and that the oracles of prophets and apostles are old wives' fables. Ten years pass by, and his supposed discovery which captivated so many minds is found to be untenable, or its contradiction to the inspired word a misconception and mistake, but the injury has been done, thousands have been led astray, the righteous vexed, and many a poor dupe of the sciolist lost. This is no overdrawn picture, but an experience in these days of popular science and criticism, as frequent and as true as it is sad and solemn. At the same time, we would not be misunderstood. Men of science have discovered, and will continue to discover, great and important facts, which may be accepted and relied on with all certainty; but what we contend for is this, that parallel discoveries have been made and will continue to be made in the text of the Holy Scriptures; and as science lights upon a new mine, from which shall be extracted a wealth of wisdom and knowledge, so will the theologian continue to find mysteries to unveil, which will open out fresh avenues of access to the One Truth which is the basis and source of all realities, material and immaterial; and when any portion of the truth is arrived at in either department, it will not sound a note of discord, but produce a harmony in the music of the universe.

The Magi used the two channels of knowledge they possessed as a binocular glass, and by the combination of the twin lenses they obtained the focus of the truth; the modern Magi apply the eye to one lens only, and the result is distortion, confusion and failure.

Let us for our part rather labour to resemble the "wise men" of old. Use all the powers of mind, and take advantage of all the opportunies afforded you for the increase of your knowledge, and whatever success attends your efforts bring the result to the cradle and cross of your King and Saviour; render to Him the talents He entrusted to your care; present to him the talents, gained in addition from their use, and give the sum total of all you have and are, body, soul, and spirit, your property and your powers to Him and His service. We have read to-day that these "wise men" saw "His star." Can we say that such a token of "light and leading" has been vouchsafed to and accepted by us? Has there been a manifestation of Christ to our own hearts? Have we heard the voice, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come," and have we now "in the time of this mortal life" put off the works of darkness and put on the armour of light? There is a precious promise given to the faithful servant in the charge sent to the church of Thyatira, "I will give him the morning star" (Rev. ii. 28), the earliest symptoms of the second Advent, the first sign of the Lord's return. Are we waiting for and watching for this final Epiphany of His presence? Let us now seek unto Him who is the Light of the World, let us walk as children of the Light, and in His Light shall we see Light, even the everlasting Light that knows no decline nor shadow of turning.

JOB AND ECCLESIASTES.—A CONTRAST.

By the Rev. GEORGE BLADON, Vicar of St. Luke's, Chadderton.

A New Year's Sermon Preached at St. Luke's, Chadderton, Oldham, on Sunday, December 30th, 1888.

"Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth, while the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh, when thou shalt say I have no pleasure in them."—Eccles. xii. 1.

THE Book of Ecclesiastes and the Book of Job stand very near together in our English Bibles, and in the Hebrew Bible they are even nearer still. But, although in this sense so near, yet they are wide apart as the poles in the pictures they present us of human nature, and in their lessons.

The Book of Job begins by showing us the picture of a man, wealthy, honoured, respected, beloved by wife and children; honouring and fearing God; hated by none except the great adversary of mankind: Then a door is, as it were, opened in heaven, like it was for St. John in the Book of the Revelation; and we are present at the council to which God summons all the ministers of His kingly state. God is on His throne, and His ministers gather round Him; and amongst them comes

Satan, the great Adversary, the Accuser. And the Lord said to Satan, Hast thou considered My servant Job? for there is none like him on the earth, a perfect man, and an upright, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil. And Satan does not deny the fact; he answers, like cynical worldly men do still, with a sneer, Is it for nought that Job fears God? Is not his piety simply a matter of profit and loss? Does he not do right only for the gain he may get thereby? Take away the gain, and then see what becomes of the goodness?

The Almighty takes up the accusation, and, to prove Job, allows Satan to despoil him of all his earthly possessions; and when all was gone, we read that Job arose, rent his mantle, and fell on the ground and worshipped, saying, "Naked came I from my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither. The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord."

And once again we see God in council, and His ministers around Him; and to Satan the Lord says, "Hast thou considered my servant Job, that that there is none like him on earth; a perfect man and an upright, one that feareth God and escheweth evil. And still he holdeth fast his integrity, although thou didst move Me against him, to swallow him up without cause." And Satan answered the Lord, and said, "A skin for a skin, and all that a man hath will he give up for his life," meaning thereby to bring the further charge against Job, that he was utterly selfish; caring for nothing, neither for his wealth, nor even for the loss of his own sons and daughters, so long as his own health and comfort were left him; therefore, as a further trial, even these things, but not his life, Satan is allowed to take away.

Thus we see a man—a good man—a man respected, honoured, and beloved, tried and afflicted to the utmost; and how does he bear his trial? He does, indeed, so far break down as to long for death; he longs to be, he says, "where the wicked cease from troubling, where the strong, worn out, find rest; where the prisoners, in peace repose together, they hear no task-master's voice; the small and the great are equal there, and the slave is free from his lord." But remember all fear of and shrinking from death is strikingly modern; it is altogether the product of this luxurious, pampered, pleasure-loving age. Job is very far from being the only good man who in olden days, when faith was firm and strong, looked death fearlessly in the face. We find Elijah praying, "It is enough; now, O Lord, take away my life." We hear David's psalm, "Oh, that I had wings like a dove, then would I flee away and be at rest": St. Paul says he is in a great strait, for the work's sake he would gladly live, but "to depart and be with Christ is far better." The men of the Reformation period feared not martyrdom; the giants of the great Puritan period were in nowise daunted at death; but we cling to our luxuries and comforts like children to their toys.

Job trusted in God. God, he knew, was on his side, despite his affliction, and whatever his narrow-minded friends might insinuate. Therefore he confidently longed for future vindication and restoration. I know, he says, that my Redeemer liveth, and He shall stand at last over this dust; and after my body hath thus been destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see on my side, and mine own eyes shall behold, not those of another.

And now let us turn to the Book of Ecclesiastes, which, as we have said, stands close to the Book of Job in the Hebrew Bible. There we see a man, not like Job, despoiled of every possession; but on whom this world's goods have been almost boundlessly bestowed. It is a man of an inquiring mind. "I gave my heart," he says, "to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all things that are done under heaven." It is a busy man. "I made me great works," he says; "I builded me houses, I planted me vineyards." It is a powerful man. "I gathered me also silver and gold, and the peculiar treasure of things and of the provinces." It is a wealthy man—one who had "great possessions of great and small cattle." It is a man, artistic and with refined tastes. "I gat me men singers and women singers," he says, "and the delights of the sons of men, as musical instruments, and that of all sorts." And it is a successful man, "great," he says, "and increased more than all; also my wisdom remained with me," But it is an *utterly disgusted* man; "I looked," he says, "on all the work that my hands had wrought, and on the labour that I have laboured to do, and behold all was vanity and vexation of spirit. What profit hath a man of all his labours which he taketh under the sun? Vanity of vanities, vanity of vanities, all is vanity."

Now is not this a very startling contrast? Job, perplexed and stricken down under the load of his misery; stung by the insults of his unsympathising and little-minded friends, stripped of every earthly thing which men call good, is yet confident, undaunted, a very hero of God; looking forward beyond the bounds of such a world as this to a future sure and certain; faithful to his Redeemer, who shall rise up for him, and shall proclaim his integrity and righteousness; while Ecclesiastes, rich, powerful, learned, refined, successful, is yet utterly miserable, and, except for one thing, utterly contemptible. Is it not strange? We only pity, even if we do pity Job, who has lost all his worldly possessions, and only wishes to die; we feel what a despicable life is that of Ecclesiastes, the man who has, and has used, and even increased all this world's goods.

What a lesson this contrast between Job and Ecclesiastes is on the value, the unspeakable value and worth of character. Even Satan dare not deny to Job integrity and blamelessness; and in the thirty-first chapter, in answer to the base insinuations of his three friends, Job reviews, in forcible simplicity, his own past life. He has been chaste, just, benevolent, pious; too magnanimous even to rejoice in the misfortune of an enemy, much less to wish him evil; so hospitable that his house stood open to all comers; so sincere that he had no secret sin to hide; he has not only refrained from wrongful gain, but even when enriched by lawful gains he has not put his trust in uncertain riches. What, then, is there that even the malice of Satan can rob Job of? He cannot take his character from him; he cannot rob him of the memory of a past well spent; he cannot force him to part with his confident assurance that God will right him and redeem him at the last; and when these things are retained in full possession, what matters the loss of wealth, or even of health? We do not pity Job; pity is lost in admiration. True, that he was tried to the utmost, and longed for death; but that did not make him pitiable; any more than St. Paul was pitiable, who also was tried and troubled, and who also longed for death. "In all things," writes St. Paul, "we approve ourselves the ministers of God, in much patienec, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses; in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings; as unknown and yet well known; as dying, and behold we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich, as having nothing, and yet possessing all things." And, again, to the Romans, St. Paul writes: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors." I think, indeed, that neither Job nor St. Paul were very much to be pitied, for they had the one thing worth having in such a world as this—a character blameless towards men, faithful towards God.

But Ecclesiastes was just the opposite of all this. He had gathered all for self, and what had he gained? He had sown for himself wealth and power and pleasure; and they had yielded a fat harvest of weariness and disgust. He had got his wish, and found it vanity and vexation of spirit; he had got all he wanted, and had found that all was vanity—vanity of vanities, vanity of vanities—all is vanity. He had lived for self, and selfishness had brought, as it always does, misery and wretchedness; he had loved his life, and therefore he had lost it; he had worshipped the creature more than the Creator, and therefore God had given him of his heart's desire, but sent leanness withal into his soul. He had loved like that selfish man in our Saviour's parable—pulling down his barns and building bigger, storing up his goods, and saying to his soul: Soul thou hast much goods laid up for many years: take thine ease—eat, drink, and be merry. And the same verdict has been given, Thou fool; only in this case the verdict had come before it was too late; and, although the wasted life could not be recalled, yet the time might be redeemed—and it was redeemed. "And, moreover, because the preacher was wise, he still taught the people knowledge; yea, he gave good heed: he sought to find out acceptable words." He could at least warn others, and he does, and his lessons are good. "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth, while the evil days come not nor the years draw nigh when thou shalt say I have no pleasure in them." That is his good lesson for the young; and his lesson for all, whether young or old, is equally good: "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the duty of every man."

They are lessons that come home to us, surely, on this the last Sunday of another year. We wish one another good New Year's wishes, and it is both natural and right to do so; but unless these two lessons be remembered, those wishes will be but as all other—merely earthly hopes and wishes—vanity, and a feeding upon the wind. We cannot tell what is in store for us during the year—prosperity or adversity, joy or sorrow, health or sickness, success or failure. But one of the principal lessons of the contrast between Job and Ecclesiastes has been told in vain if we have not learned that on none of these mere outward things will our happiness depend. We may have all the success that the preacher, Ecclesiastes, had; we may gain wealth and fame and learning, and may be honoured amongst men; but if we use them as he used them, they will be to us what they were to him—vanity and vexation of spirit. If we live for self, if we long and strive after the lusts of the flesh, and the lusts of the eye, and all the proud pomp of life, then, no matter whether we get these things or not, the year will be a failure, but another of those on which we shall sometime look back with sorrow and regret as the years in which we have found no pleasure. Or the coming year may be full of trials and afflictions; dark days may grow even darker. But it can hardly find us worse off in a worldly sense than Job was when those three foolish friends of his came to console him, and did not. And of this we may be quite sure: God will send to each one of us exactly what we can, if we will, make to be the best for us: all things, remember, work together for good to them that love God. God does not promise us earthly success—health or wealth—He only sets before us duty, and He gives us the power to do that duty. And, if we do it, then we shall find all other things of no great matter. For the preacher was wise. Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter. Fear God and keep His commandments: for this

is the duty of every man. Remember thy Creator now; remember Him day by day and every day; remember Him, and serve in work and in labour—in thought, in word, and in act; remember Him, and fear Him, for he shall bring everything into judgment, whether it be good, or whether it be evil; remember Him, and love Him, for He hath redeemed thee: He calleth thee to Himself, and if thou wilt serve and love Him during the years of this fast-failing life, thou shalt live with Him through all the ages of eternity.

NOTES FOR CHILDREN'S SERMON.

By the Rev. H. G. ROSEDALE.

SOME time ago we considered how we might learn from the letters of our Lord's name what sort of lives to lead. Let us now think how the same letters may teach us what blessings we enjoy as a result of a childlike love to the Saviour. Spell our Lord's name :—

J = Justified.—Explained, means made just or all right before God. *Story:* Prisoner accused and about to be condemned; another comes and takes his place in the dock—bears his punishment. The law has no further hold on such a man for that offence. So we are justified before God by Jesus bearing our punishment so well deserved.

E = Exalted. — Before poor sinners; but through his blood, "Sons of God," Princes, inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. *Story of Joseph.* Slave in prison—now Governor of Egypt, &c. With Joseph the honour could not last very long. *We* are exalted for ever.

S = Saved. — What from? Sorrows in this life and condemnation in the life to come. *Story:* Little girl falls into mill-stream; is borne on suddenly. The father springs in. On—on—he catches hold of the child just as she is sinking for the last time. Saved from death! Joy! Saved by a father's love. We are saved by the love Jesus bore us.

U = United.—(*a*) To Him who has loved us so, and (*b*) also to other Christians. "We love Him because He first loved us," and because He has told us so. "Lo, I am with you always." His Holy Spirit dwells in our hearts. Matrimony represents the unity between Christ and the Church. Holy Communion speaks to us of our union in a common Christian brotherhood.

S. = Sealed.—A document sealed binds the parties concerned in the strongest way. Jesus with His blood sealed us to Himself—made us His property, and so we belong to Him; can, therefore, look to Him for all our wants, but must not forget our duty in consequence of belonging to Him. A member of a family bound to uphold the honour of the family; so we must always stand up for Jesus.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly
CURED
by simply using the
AMMONIAPHONE
FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.
21s. post free.
WILL LAST FOR YEARS.
Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials may be had FREE OF CHARGE on application to Medical Battery Co. Ltd.
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1889.

CONCERNING CHURCHWARDENS.—III.

EXPERIENCE proves that, in cases of resistance to an aggression from without, accompanied or not by internal defections, there is a great danger impending from two opposite quarters. There may be, first, too little in the ways of self-defence, and then too much. Those hard to move may become maddened after a while, and fight with blind fury. Now, in the case of the existing aggression upon the Church of England, which is so enormous in its aims, that this Church is sought to be thrown back behind the Reformation, and so impudent in its sophistry that the very standards of this intensely Protestant movement are misinterpreted, as by Santa Clara and Dr. Newman after him, into conformity with the religion of the Canons of Trent, which religion they strongly repudiate and traverse,—one must examine calmly how the case may be dealt with effectually, and the dangers indicated not fallen into in the defence. Commencing resistance solely from a central point of organisation, when the evils have run ahead and taken deep root, and become overt in action and confident in spirit, is a very up-hill sort of undertaking. It has to establish itself first on a basis responsible and respectable enough for its great effort. It must next penetrate everywhere—in order to act everywhere. It must awake sleepers, alarm indifference, convict sophistry, and make itself known and welcome, not only by the successes it can point to, but also by the moderation it displays in its tone.

All this is slow work, though good work.

And for those who are so engaged we have the highest respect, and we are far from impeding or weakening them in the least degree. But, again, what about the "too much"? There is nothing so dangerous in a prolonged contest as the loss of temper and the weakening of the moral sense. One may well take the Laudian project of "thorough," as a case in point. Here, as even Heylin lets out, ambitious priestcraft allied itself with absolute kingcraft, and what was the end, but laycraft, with first a long Parliament and then a military dictator, the engineer of a furious fanaticism. Nor was all this evil unforeseen. Reference to history shows that the Cromwellians had not a few Jesuits in disguise among their ranks in battles fought against the Royalists; also that the news of King Charles the First's decapitation was no unwelcome or unexpected morsel for the Sovereign Pontiff.

In the light therefore of these two extremes to which resistance itself is liable, one must test our humble but earnest proposition to establish at once "An English Churchwardens' Union." Now, as to the first difficulty of "too little." Its organisation in the way of universal expansion is an accomplished fact "incumbent upon the inhabitants of every parish;" in its legal status it is an accepted institution, and in its personal binding a matter of rightful enforcement. This gets rid of and obviates the need for deputations, appeals, platforms, and all other of the usual methods to promote and extend opinion and action in the required direction. Like the glands necessary for distribution of the lymphatic secretions that are located over the body, rather indeed more like the wide branchings out of the nervous system, here are the churchwardens already in their places, and appointed for the work of "observation and complaint." All that is proposed more, is to establish a connection with a centre. Suppose we call this—a brain. Now this offers an enormous "quoin of vantage" to begin with, as compared with the very highest status won by long and noble perseverance of the bravest and best workers among honest, Protestant Voluntary Associations, also as compared with the present Churchwardens' isolation.

And then as for "the too much," here will be found no temptations to infuse a general sourness of distrust, or to stimulate a cowardly exit in blank despair. Here will be no temptation towards, because no occasion for, "anger, wrath, malice, evil-speaking, especially of dignities." Indeed there need be no talking at all, nor "many masters," perhaps exhibiting somewhat of a dictatorial effusiveness. It is merely the Church's own officers doing the Church's own work in the Church's own way and most thoroughly helping one another so to act. Nobody need be the wiser as to the action being taken; every one must be happier in the results achieved, except innovators and law-breakers, with, of course, their gulls, and their Lordships, who must register their reasons for allowing the illegal changes to proceed. We submit that suggestions such as have been now advanced by us "concerning churchwardens" are not unworthy, at least "*à priori*," of some consideration by the friends of the Church of England, and just because in the spirit of this Church advanced. Why not, then, try the experiment? London may not only be generally assumed the proper headquarters of such an "union." It is also peculiarly needing this for itself. If it be objected that this is the day of local self-government, true, is not this exactly what we urge, coupled with a requisite centralisation, a fact also admitted. As by the balance of the centrifugal and centripetal pressures in equilibrium the earth consists, so too will the Church thus survive. A small subscription from each churchwarden in the Church of England would mount up to a large annual item. The contributions of the "three parishioners" need not be despised, nor from others who want the Church of England to continue a Church, instead of being turned into a sect—the most narrow in its spirit and most cruel in its career—that has yet defaced the fair form of Christ's religion. A small staff in an unpretentious office, with a well-known president and committee, above all with a first-rate legal adviser, would do the business well, at a minimum expenditure. By an immediate establishment, the Churchwardens Union would embrace those officers to be appointed next Easter, and set to work not an hour too early in an intelligent co-operation to do their duty and save the Church of England. "So may it be."

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Collect for Fourth Sunday after Epiphany.

In this Collect we approach God as our powerful and all-knowing Father. We bring our request before Him on the plea of our own weakness and insufficiency. Our strength is to be, "that which is from above"—the strength of "Our Father." The child's cry does not appeal to the mother's heart more because her offspring has before been able to do without her help—the sickly one, the weak one rather calls for an active tender yearning Love from a mother's heart. So does our weakness form the strongest plea for a father's help. Dangers surround us on every side—dangers that we can see and recondite perils of every sort—physical and spiritual ills beset us everywhere on our path through life. Sometimes we think we are clever enough to steer clear of the difficulties, but as time goes on we are at last obliged to confess our utter weakness and our need of help and support. How often, too, has the Christian man or woman realised the power of Jesus Christ to save from sin? How many a soul has been saved from committing some sin, through the memory of Jesus hanging on the cross for *them*, by the silent prayer for support, or even by the supplicating ejaculation of

that precious name? He is "able to save to the uttermost" is our firm assurance, and in that fact we rejoice on this Sunday. How expressive to the true Christian are the concluding words of the prayer, "And carry us through all temptations!" What a contrast! Utter helplessness and great strength!—the Shepherd carrying the lamb over the rocky ground—the parent lifting the little one up to avoid some difficult bit of the road. But can we fail to notice that we must leave *all* in His hands. We must only trust Him, not strive to do anything but simply rest in His arms; going whither He takes us and not seeking out our own path. Safety can only be found in God: so let us make this Collect our prayer to God for the coming week.

Reviews and Notices.

"WITH THE IMMORTALS." By F. Marion Crawford. 2 Vols. London: Macmillan & Co.

WHAT have we here? Another anthologia culled from those to one of whom it was said:—

Αἱ δὲ τεαὶ ζώουσιν ἀηδόνες, ἦσιν ὁ πάντων
Ἅρπακτὴρ Ἀΐδης οὐκ ἐπὶ χεῖρα βαλεῖ?*

Or peradventure a book of the "Letters-from-Hell" order, an attempt to evolve the world to come out of the writer's own consciousness? But, on beginning to read, one next opined that mere fiction was to be the medium and exponent of spiritism. However, the first thought proved to be nearest the mark. A wealthy and cultured amateur scientist, to whom money is no object, with his wife and her sister and mother, takes an old castle in Italy over against the isles of the Sirens; and by means of his changing the electric conditions of their environment, they come *en rapport* with some of the élite of the mighty dead; and Heine and Chopin, Lionardo da Vinci and Cæsar, Pascal and Dr. Johnson, Bayard and Francis the First of France, disport themselves through the two volumes; becoming interlocutors with the visionary Augustus Chard, with Lady Brenda, the travelled lady, whose forte is intuition, with the practical Gwendoline, and Diana, the sister, who "had the temperament of a poet with the mind of a lawyer." The social, religious, and other topics of the day come up by turns, and are touched with the light hand of one who has read much and thought *as* much, passing from grave to gay and into grave again, with all through a clear set towards Faith and Righteousness. Each ghostly but not uncanny visitant is made to speak more or less in the style, and according to the lights of his lifetime, plus those he may be supposed to have gathered since; and this seems to be well done, *e.g.*, the ponderous peremptoriness of Samuel Johnson is well hit off. It must have been a difficult book to write, and is hardly a light one to read. Some songs of the Sirens towards the end, show the author's pen as facile for pleasing verse as for diversified prose. The whole, of course, is purely subjective, less objective even than if we had a spiritist claiming to report the dead: and we are no nearer what those worthies would have thought of our present-day questions, and not much nearer an answer to the questions themselves. "Diana" "enjoys the pleasure of argument more than the hope of solution," and in these words is a forecast of the book itself. To give an inkling of the writer's style, take the following: "I believe there is a pitch in Art where pleasure becomes vicious; the limit certainly exists in sculpture and painting as well as in literature, just as when a man takes too much wine." This is put into the mouth of Chopin. Heine again is made to say, "I believe that literature without realism cannot last: I believe also that literature without romance cannot interest. "Pascal, acutely and justly, would have "thought it very wrong to starve himself, because thinking it impossible to suffer voluntarily any pain without feeling a moral satisfaction in the mortification of the body, and that satisfaction is vanity, and destroys the good done." Why at p. 137, Vol. ii., England's emancipation of her slaves is not named with "Catholic emancipation and free-trade," as of "the highly sentimental measures" by which she had climbed to "her zenith of power thirty years ago," is not obvious. But when Bayard says, "I went through life with one idea, one motto—always to do what you are afraid of doing (the thing one fears to do is seldom bad)," it is a practical if paradoxical hint enough to make the book that imbeds it worth reading—and buying.

"THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS." By Richard Holt Hutton, M.A. Third edition, revised. London: Macmillan and Co.

ORDINARILY the third edition of a book might be allowed to pass with a brief mention of the bare fact that such third edition has been called for. But Mr. Hutton's essays demand, we think, more. They are of permanent value, because, although almost every essay has been called forth by some controversy, or by the publication of some book, yet Mr. Hutton is never satisfied with defeating such issues as had a mere temporary interest; he never contents himself with answering such arguments as are merely superficial, but goes down to the roots from which the error sprung. Hence—because root errors are recurrent, having the human heart for their soil, though the form in which they will manifest themselves will vary according to the fleeting fashions of the hour—Mr. Hutton's essays are of the very highest permanent value. For instance, the controversy raised by Dean Mansel's Bampton lectures on the "Limits of Religious Thought" now slumbers and sleeps; but doubts about the manner and method, even the possibility of God's revelation of Himself, awake again and again. And therefore this is one of the best essays in the book. Mr. Hutton, because more calm and judicial minded, understands Dean Mansel better probably than Mr. Maurice did. Mr. Maurice's answer, "What is Revelation?" was a protest—an embodiment of a completely opposite conviction, the insurrection of an outraged faith, the protest of "a powerful character," Mr. Hutton calls it; it may therefore have been of more immediate use, it may even be better, —but it cannot be so permanent as the argument in Mr. Hutton's essay. Fiery eloquence too often burns itself away, and, like the bee, dies when it destroys its adversary. Mr. Hutton's essay can be used again. It does not merely show why Dean Mansel's views are wrong, why his position is untenable; but it shows why regulative truths alone would be useless, even repulsive to the human heart; and also what a guiding, educating revelation must be. And when Mr. Hutton, leaving Dean Mansel altogether, writes on the direct Revelation of God through the con-

* *Alias.* "Culled from those whose works the world will never let die."

science which the Jew had, and the indirect Revelation through nature, which the Gentiles, especially the Greeks, had, every sentence is as full of compressed teaching as spring water is of compressed air. It is an admirable essay. Those who have read it three or four times before, as we have, will be delighted to read it again in this handy well-printed edition.

In the essay on "The Historical Problems of the Fourth Gospel," we are inclined to think Mr. Hutton sets too much value on Baur's criticisms. But, be this so or not, the keen insight into character, and the power to recall the past, which the essay displays, is beyond all praise. In arguing, for instance, that the fourth Gospel is right in placing the cleansing of the Temple at the beginning of Christ's Ministry rather than at its close, Mr. Hutton's arguments are very different from those too often used by the mere wrangling controversialist. Whether we are convinced or not, we feel that in Mr. Hutton's company we are with one who understands how Christ was *likely* to act. And there *is* great force in such an argument as this :—"Nor do I think that at a time when Christ saw clearly how much deeper than any improprieties in the Temple service the cancer had grown into the national life, this would have seemed to Him a reform important enough to attempt. His 'hour was come.' His spirit was nerved for the suffering before Him. He saw that the hope of the world lay, as much as it lay in anything human, in the little band of personal disciples, not in the services of the Temple; and I believe He was much more anxious then to sow an ineffaceable trust in the minds of His Apostles than He could be to brush away the uppermost stratum of Pharisaic rottenness. The mood in which He wept over Jerusalem as past recovery was not the mood in which He would have driven sellers of oxen and sheep out of the Gentiles' court. And when one remembers—if I may assume for a moment the genuineness of the Gospel on which I am writing—how deeply the relation between the 'baptism of water' and the 'baptism of the spirit' enters into that conversation with Nicodemus which immediately follows the purification of the Temple in the narrative of this Evangelist; and how again the relation between the temples made with hands on Mount Zion and Gerizim and the universal spiritual Temple enters into the conversation on the 'water of life' with the Samaritan woman, which follows next, I cannot doubt that the religious problem as to the *grounds* of spiritual purification, suggested by the Baptist's ministry, was predominant in Christ's mind at this first period of His career, and that to that period we owe the event misplaced in the synoptic gospels."

But we like best of all the essay on "The Incarnation and the Principles of Evidence." It is a masterpiece. If any of our readers have an educated friend wavering towards Unitarianism by all means let them put Mr. Hutton's essay in his hands. What *kind* of testimony is sufficient to enable us to believe the fact of the Incarnation—the need for a knowledge of God's absolute and essential nature, as well as what He is *to us*—the light that the Incarnation throws on the seeming contradictions of human nature—the supposed metaphysical contradiction that an Infinite Being could not become finite, or take up human nature into his own, except as a mere simulated appearance, these are the foundations on which Mr. Hutton builds an unassailable fortress of truth. What we have said above—that Mr. Hutton's arguments are never temporary only, or merely controversial—is of this essay most true. Take, for instance, this passage (he is speaking of the Jewish Messianic expectations): "Their history," he says, "records a long series of connected facts which preceded [Christ's birth], and a long series of connected facts which succeeded. Does the one seem to anticipate and to culminate fairly in the mere sending of a new and great prophet? Does the other seem to derive its vital influence over the ages from the mere enunciations of a great departed prophet? Or does the harmonious development of the world's history seem to require at this point some great focus of the world's life, some actual union of God and man—an Incarnation? There is no doubt that at this point the history of an Oriental people, whose great work it was to learn and to teach the personal government of a righteous God, blends with the history of the Gentile nations, with the fountains of Greek art and philosophy, with the system of Roman equity, with the whole civilisation of the West; and all that it thus takes up into itself becomes coloured by a revolutionised form of the old Oriental faith. But may not the great crisis be accounted for by this very fact—the confluence of different streams of national life—without assuming any divine act greater than the sending of a new and more Catholic-minded prophet? I think not, for I think the Jewish history culminated *before* the influence of Greece or Rome rushed in; and that the Christian history began, in germ and essence, *before* the confluence alluded to, though it was materially modified thereby. To me it seems that both the Jewish history is truncated and the Christian history maimed if you disbelieve in a real Incarnation at a point where the two coalesce. The one would be a gradual ascent without a summit—a chain of purposes without a consummation—the other a wide and permanent stream, with a shallow and temporary source—a new life for man without a new source of inspiration."

This, it is true, is not an argument for popular use. But to one who reads and loves history, believing Universal History to be God's Universal Bible, is it not most convincing? We do not say you cannot answer that, but we do ask, can you remain unaffected by it? And we think we can ask the same of every essay in the book.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

SIR,—I had no intention of occupying your valuable space again, but as Mr. "Edmund Lawrence" (of Armagh) calls the Guild, in Trinity College, "a pitiful mare's nest," and "mythical," and that there could be no such thing as "the Rules of the Guild of the Holy Trinity," I must again state that such a Guild does exist. Lord Plunket spoke of the "Guild," and of "one of those who belong to it"—Lord Plunket evidently did not think it all "a myth." If Lord Plunket was able "to take notice of it," so could the authorities of Trinity College if they chose. So much for the "myth" theory, which your correspondent now says was "never contradicted!" But the main point is what do these young men teach and hold? Celibacy of the clergy,

habitual auricular confession to a priest, reception of Holy Communion only when fasting, the presence of Christ's natural and risen body in the consecrated bread, &c. Let "Edmund Lawrence" take a ticket up to Dublin, and attend one of the meetings of the College Theological Society, and hear for himself the doctrines put out by these young men. They make no secret of their opinions as to the Virgin Mary, confession, Priestly power, &c. Is this what Mr. Lawrence calls the "advance" of "sound church principles"?

"Edmund Lawrence" says "Dr. Wright made no statements that are inconsistent with mine." Why, sir, Dr. Wright plainly and openly spoke of what your correspondent calls a "myth," and of the "Rules" of the Guild, which he now calls a "pitiful mare's nest," and says "which Guild or confraternity has not any existence" (PULPIT, No. 656). I ask your readers, is there any use trying to convince one who thus contradicts himself, and says one thing one time and another thing another time? Let them take the trouble to read Dr. Wright's able Speech and Appendix (Dublin, William McGee, one penny), and compare my statements and Dr. Wright's with those of your "Armagh" correspondent, and judge for themselves how far he and the learned doctor agree. The Rev. Ernest A. Wright (son of Dr. Wright), was one of the ablest champions of Protestantism while he was a student in Trinity College, Dublin. He is now doing good work as Curate of Cahir, Co. Tipperary; but his mantle seems to have fallen upon Mr. Ellison, who is giving the "mythical" Guildites some hard nuts to crack. I am sure the poor fellows would be glad of your Armagh correspondent's advocacy in the debates if he could come down south; unless he, too, is a "myth" himself.

A MEMBER OF THE DUBLIN DIOCESAN SYNOD.

Dublin, January 29th, 1889.

ST. JOHN, THE AUTHOR OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL. BY H. H. EVANS.

SIR,—Some time ago you asked me to review the work, the title of which stands above. I did so, and found myself unable to speak favourably of it. Mr. Evans thereupon wrote to you, and complained of my unfairness and *animus*.

In the January number of the *Church Quarterly Review* there is a notice of the book. I do not know who wrote it, but I quote a few extracts:—

"Mr. Evans has previously written a book to prove that St. Paul was the author of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Third Gospel; on this occasion he has chosen a more hopeful theme, but we cannot congratulate him on the manner in which he has executed it. . . . The differences between this Gospel and the Apocalypse, Mr. Evans wholly ignores. He has made his book almost entirely out of extracts from other books. . . . There are resemblances in phraseology between the Gospel and the Apocalypse, but in the list given in the Appendix a large number of phrases are included on which absolutely no stress can be laid at all. . . . The greater part of this long list is absolutely valueless. . . . The fact that he omits all accents when he writes Greek will not please scholars" (pp. 473, 474).

In short, by his uncritical methods, Mr. Evans simply plays into the hands of sceptical writers of the Tübingen school.

YOUR REVIEWER.

THE FOURTH ARTICLE.

SIR,—What is the bearing of the Fourth Article on the questions respecting the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice? That article declares that our Lord at His rising from the dead took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature. St. Paul tells us that the bodies of men, when they shall rise on the last day, shall be, not their natural bodies (ψυχικός), but their spiritual bodies (πνευματικός). According also to what St. Paul tells us, the body, with which our Lord rose, was a body of the same nature as those bodies shall be which men shall have at the last resurrection. It is not, I suppose, that the resurrection body is not the same as the old body, because it does not of necessity become not the same when it becomes spiritual and not natural. But the resurrection body has qualities which the old body has not; it is incorruptible and immortal. So is our Lord's body since His resurrection. It also, manifested qualities and powers which did not belong to His natural body. When the two disciples met our Lord on the evening of the first Easter Day, they did not recognise Him. He vanished after supper out of their sight. He came afterwards to the meeting of the disciples, appearing to them in a room whose doors were closed. He appealed to the evidence of His identity given by His flesh and His bones, saying nothing of His blood—which omission is repeated in the language of the Fourth Article. But all these differences do not go to make His resurrection body less perfect than His natural body had been. It is not to be imagined that the glorified body of our Lord Jesus Christ should be less perfect than the body of His humiliation.

The Eucharistic Sacrifice is a representation of the sacrifice of our Lord's natural body, when He shed His blood and poured out His life for the redemption of the world. That natural body ceased to exist as such, and became a spiritual body. The sacrifice, therefore, as represented in the Eucharist, is not representative of an offering that never was offered. It is representative of the offering up of our Lord's natural body, not of His glorified body which ascended in the cloud. It is a representation, not a repetition. There cannot be a repetition of an event when that, upon which the event depended, has ceased to exist in the form, and under the conditions, in which it existed at the occurrence of the event.

Christ promised to be always with His Church—unto the world's end. But He departed, almost at the utterance of this promise; fulfilling the promise, as many of God's promises are fulfilled, in a much completer way than if He had fulfilled it as men may have imagined by His words that He would. His spiritual body dwells in heaven; His spirit descended upon earth, and abides here still.

Regarding the Fourth Article under these considerations, its remarkable omissions, in accordance with Luke 24, v. 39, of mention of our Lord's blood, is perfectly consistent with the perfection of man's nature that it speaks of. That perfection is the completed perfection of man's glorified resurrection state, not the lower perfection of man's animal and earthly nature.

In connection with this, it must be evident that the natural body of Christ spoken of in the Black Rubric does not mean His natural body, according to the meaning of natural (ψυχικός) in St. Paul's exposition of the resurrection; for it is Christ's glorified body

that is in heaven. Natural, in that rubric, means material. The resurrection body, though not natural but spiritual, is still material, as our Lord distinctly showed His to be. B.

28th January, 1889.

At Wycliffe Hall this term no fewer than five courses of lectures are offered—(1) On the Elements of Christian Doctrine ; (2) On the Historical Books of the Old Testament, their Age, Authorship, and Contents ; (3) On the Psalms ; (4) Hints on the Preparation of Sermons ; (5) Hebrew. Besides these lectures eight addresses will be given in the hall on the Elements of the Christian Life.

Mr. Gore, the Principal of the Pusey House, offers this term, in addition to the lectures on the doctrine of the Incarnation which he delivers as a College Lecturer at Trinity, the following courses :—On Sundays, at noon, lectures on the Prophets, Hosea, Micah, &c. ; and on Mondays four lectures on the Holy Spirit and the Inspiration of Scripture. Besides these, preparation for Holy Communion is held in the chapel on Saturdays at 9 p.m. ; and the Librarians (of whom there are now four) "give any help in their power in the study of theology without reference to the schools."

The actual buildings of Mansfield College are now nearly approaching completion, and make altogether an effective and imposing block. They stand on one of the most beautiful sites in Oxford, just to the east of the Warden of Wadham's garden, between the University parks and Holywell-street. They look due south—that is, in the direction of Oxford, and have a really glorious view of the spires and towers of the city. They are built in the shape of a hollow square open towards the south. At the extreme west end—that is, the end nearest the Wadham-gardens, stands the Principal's house. Next to this, and forming the west side of the square, is a very large and handsome library. Opposite this, and forming the east side of the square, while it runs itself north and south, is the chapel, also a lofty and stately building. One feature in it, Mr. Champneys, the architect, seems to have borrowed from King's College Chapel. Under the windows, which are perpendicular in character, there runs a series of rather low side chapels, which seem to act as buttresses to the main building. The effect of these outside is certainly striking ; inside they serve as a kind of ambulatory or narrow aisle running round the nave. In the middle of the north or principal side of the hollow square stands a central tower, plain and massive ; west of this are lecture-rooms and some living-rooms for tutors, east are the common rooms and the dining-hall. In order to throw up this central tower the architect has kept both these wings low and plain. The lecture-rooms in particular present a front of almost blank wall, and the hall on the other side is not an imposing building. The result is that this main front of the building has a somewhat mean appearance. The intention seems to be that, while within the college itself no actual accommodation is to be provided for the students, who will live in lodgings in the town, they will yet live to some extent a common life, studying together in the library, meeting one another in the lecture-rooms and common room, and dining together in the college hall. The new buildings will be in part occupied in the course of next term, but are not likely to be formally opened till after the Long Vacation.

At Mansfield College, or rather in the temporary lecture-rooms which at present take its place, the Principal, Dr. Fairbairn, lectures on Systematic Theology, the Doctrine of Sin, and on Introduction to Theism ; while the Vice-Principal takes as his subjects the Epistle to the Galatians and the earlier Pauline Epistles.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bartlam, Rev. W. E., Curate of St. Mary's, Hornsey Rise ; Bishop's Rector of Spanish Town, Jamaica.
Betts, Rev. J. A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Columba's, Notting Hill.
Briggs, Rev. Henry, Chaplain of St. Nicholas Hospital, Salisbury ; Public Preacher in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Buston, Rev. Thomas, Curate-in-Sole-Charge of Rotherfield, Sussex ; Vicar of Arlington, Sussex.
Buswell, Rev. William, jun., Curate of Fishponds, Bristol ; Rector of Smeeton-Westerby, Leicestershire.
Campbell, Rev. Stephen Melton, Curate ; Rector of Wolverdington, Warwickshire,
Daunt, Rev. John, Curate of Stella ; Vicar, of Shotteswell, Warwickshire.
Eagles, Rev. Charles Frederick, B.A., Curate of Redditch ; Vicar of Coughton Warwickshire.
Ferguson, Rev. John Grant, Rector of Oxhill, Warwickshire.
Green, Rev. Henry Sheppard, Curate of Holbrook ; Rector of Horsted Keynes, Sussex.
Griffin, Rev. Horatio J., Assoc. Sec. of C.P.A. for the North-Eastern District, Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Ripon ; Permission to Preach in the Diocese of Durham.
Grub, Rev. Charles, Curate of St. Ninian's, Glasgow ; Curate of St. Michael's and All Angels', Portsmouth.
Jalland, Rev. A. E., Vicar of Woolley ; General and Organising Secretary of the Wakefield Diocesan Societies.
Jennings, Rev. Courtenay Balderston, B.A., Vicar of Hose, Leicestershire.
Kinns, Rev. Dr. Samuel, F.R.A.S., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Minories.
Norman, Rev. Robert Manners, M.A., Rector of Bottesford, Leicestershire.
Plant, Rev. Arthur W., Chaplain to the *Colossus.*
Pidcock, Rev. Benjamin C., Chaplain to the Royal Marine Depôt, Walmer.
Rainier, Rev. William V., Chaplain to the *Victor Emanuel* (additional), for Hong Kong Dockyard.
Ross-Lewin, Rev. Robert D. O. ; Chaplain to the *Indus.*
Sanderson, Rev. Prebendary, D.D., Head Master of Lancing College ; Canon Residentiary of Chichester Cathedral.
Stockdale, Rev. Charles, B.A., Curate of Franche, Kidderminster ; Vicar of Stoke Prior, Bromsgrove.
Tanner, Rev. George Alfred, B.A., Rector of Cold Overton, Leicestershire.
Trevor, Rev. T. Warren, M.A., Rector of Llangfaes-cum-Penmon, Anglesea ; Rector of Machynlleth, Montgomeryshire.
Whitehead, Rev. Francis, M.A., Rector of Pembridge, Herefordshire.
Wood, Rev. William Manners, Curate of Faversham, Kent ; Rector of Church Lawford, Rugby.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Berry, Rev. T., Vicar of St. Werbergh's, Derby, on the 28rd ult., aged 82.
Carwardine, Rev. Thomas W., for forty-five years Vicar of Cavenham, at Cavenham, Suffolk, on the 25th ult., aged 70.
Gale, Rev. William Henry, late Chaplain in H.M.I. Service, at Braintree, on the 16th ult., aged 49.
Harwood, Rev. Reynold, Chaplain and Master of Lucas's Hospital, Wokingham, at 1, Manilla Crescent, Weston-super-Mare, on the 27th ult.
Mansfield, Rev. Edward, B.A., late Vicar of Higham, at Worthing, on the 25th ult., aged 69.
Meldicott, Rev. Samuel, at Bowness Rectory, Burgh-by-Sands, on the 20th ult., aged 56.
Pym, Rev. Charles Melville, after a few hours' illness, at the Rectory, Cherry Burton, Hull, on the 27th ult., aged 54.

The Church of England Pulpit.

RENUNCIATION OF SELF IN TEACHING.

By the Rev C. T OVENDEN, B.D., Rector of Enniskillen and Precentor of Clogher.

Sermon Preached in Enniskillen Church, on Sunday, December 23rd, 1888. The Fourth Sunday in Advent.

"I am the voice of one crying in the Wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord."—St. John i. 23.

THIS was the answer made by John the Baptist to the Jews who sent a deputation of priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him "Who art thou?" Some thought he was the Christ, showing how general was the expectation of a coming Messiah at that time; others thought he was Elijah who had appeared in fulfilment of the prophecy of Malachi: "Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of that great and dreadful day of the Lord." Others again thought he might be "that prophet" mentioned by Moses whom they were to hear. John the Baptist denies that he is any of these. He seems to wish to sink his personality, to make little of himself. This utter renunciation of self and all personal pretensions by John is a trait in his character well worthy of our observation. It is such an uncommon character. St. John might have made a great man of himself, the people were ready to give him the highest position. He had started as a prophet six months before our Lord's baptism, when Jesus was working as a young carpenter in the workshop of Joseph, and the people crowded to hear the mighty John. We read in St. Matthew's Gospel, how the people, the soldiers, the publicans, all classes of the community, came round to ask him what they should do, ready to take his advice, to regard him as the greatest oracle that had appeared among men. He had only to accept the homage of the people to raise himself to the highest pinnacle of fame, but we find he labours to make himself less than nothing. Speaking of Christ he says, "He that coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoes' latchet I am not worthy to unloose;" not worthy to do the meanest office for Him who was to follow. Now who can rise to greatness such as this? who so hide himself behind his message? who can say "I am but the voice"? And yet this must ever be the spirit of all true followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. Our work must always be to exalt our Divine Master and to sink ourselves, to be so absorbed in the progress of His great cause, that we care not who advances it so that it only is advanced. The person who sees first his own advancement and afterwards that of the cause of his Master must of necessity be small. It is quite true the world sometimes calls such men great, but in reality, in the sight of God, they are small. Let us contrast two characters. The character of Ridley and Latimer with the character of Napoleon, so called the Great. Remember how those bishops stood up against the power of the day, and gave their lives a willing sacrifice for the sake of the truth; and as they were led out to the stake to be burned alive, Latimer said to Ridley: "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle by God's grace in England as I trust never shall be put out." Little did they think of themselves so that the cause prospered, and that cause has prospered ever since. Contrast with them the character of Napoleon the Great, who sacrificed millions of human lives for the gratification of his personal ambition, whose last words as he lay on his dying bed were: "*Tête d'armée.*" He, the head of the army. He would be exalted, no matter what became of the cause of the Empire of France.

Surely, in modern politics we see an awful example of this selfish spirit. Men take up a cause, no matter what it may be, on the condition that it shall be a stepping-stone to their own personal greatness. How often have we observed this, that it is all "the cause," "the glorious cause," so long as they are in office; but when they are out of office they will talk of this same cause with the greatest bitterness, with the most intense opposition, simply because their rivals are to have the honour of advancing it. I believe that this is so very serious a degradation of character, that it must affect the prosperity and morality of our nation as a whole. But bad as this spirit is when introduced into politics, how very much worse is it when introduced into religion; it makes religion simply an abomination in the sight of God. I believe that this danger of advancing ourselves by means of the cause is one which more especially besets the teachers of religion.

It must also, however, in a certain measure affect the laity, because our Church occupies so large a part of our social life. We know that the Church can be made the stepping-stone to social advancement. Many a man, not content with being a humble Christian in the rank and file of the Church, finds that if he moves over to some dissenting body he becomes at once a man of importance and an office-bearer, and so on—in fact, that remark has been made to me as a reason for leaving the Church and going over to some other body. Not satisfied with the fact that the Gospel is preached and the truth taught, he must have a personal share in the direction and control of this preaching. Yes, and this worldly spirit of self-seeking may intrude itself into the Church without

going out of it to other denominations. We may have miserable disputes about seats in the Church—who should sit behind us, who may be allowed to sit before us, and so on, and in the meantime what becomes of the Master's cause? What becomes of the great cause of Christ, for which we are to contend earnestly, while we are miserably thinking about ourselves. Alas for the cause degraded before men by such so-called supporters! But enough of the wrong spirit; let us turn to contemplate the right. It is a grand thing, an ennobling influence to be engaged in the support of a good cause for the sake of which we are ready to sink ourselves, and go down even to the death. And have we not such cause? On Christmas-day, this week, the great standard of the Son of Man will again be unfurled. Who is ready to follow? who is ready to contend to the death for His sake? who is ready to go forth like John the Baptist to make straight in the desert a highway for our God? Work is set before us if only we do it. Our lesson on this, the last Sunday in Advent, is "Make straight the way of the Lord." God could have made straight the way of Christ at His First Coming without human aid, but he chose to send John the Baptist, and to use him as a means. Even so it is now with us, He is pleased to call upon us for work. "Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain." Yes, the spiritual navvies must do that work, the road must be made for the advance of the Lord. In this glorious work, then, we are called to promote the spread of the everlasting Gospel by labouring to take hindrances out of the way.

On last Sunday we laboured well so far as our gifts went in making straight in the desert of heathen lands the way of the Lord. We sent our contributions to the Church Missionary Society in order that Christ's Gospel might progress where the truth is not known, "but what are we doing at home?" Now the great means of advancing the cause of the Lord in this land is the organisation of our church. But when we speak of organisation of the Church we often think of it in a general sort of way, forgetting that the work of the Church means simply the collective work of the individual members of that Church. If the work of the Church is to be effectual it must be by each individual Christian labouring hard in his own little sphere to make straight the way of the Lord. You have heard of the coral reefs of the Pacific Ocean. You know that they are mighty masses of rock against which the largest waves dash themselves in vain. How are they made? By the little insects, each depositing his little grain of solid matter, building up these rocks grain by grain until the whole is formed in one compact mass. Even so is it with the work of the Church; it is made up of the tiny individual actions of each separate Christian.

Making straight the way of the Lord is a work of spiritual engineering of stupendous magnitude. Who can grasp the spectacle of the day of its completion, when the way of the Lord shall have been made straight, and He himself shall advance in His glory? "Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death;" yes, that is the day for which we look, that is the cause for which we labour, ready to "suffer the loss of all things and count them as dung that we may win Christ and be found in Him." We have to ask what have we been doing to further that cause? Is the way of the Lord any straighter because of our work during the year now drawing to a close—What efforts have we made to fulfil that prayer, "Thy Kingdom come"? Our year's success must not be measured by asking, "How much have I hoarded?" "How have I outstripped so and so in the race for position or fame?" but rather the true success of the year must be measured by this question "What have I done for God or for His cause?" It is not so easy to define the ways in which we may make straight the way of the Lord, because they are so very various. Some have means at their disposal, and can do great things with them. Some have not. The Bishop, in his circular which you heard read this morning, points out the danger which besets the very existence of the Church in this diocese so clearly that I need add nothing to his words. But all of us, whether we like it or not, are forced to show an example to our fellow creatures who must either make straight or obstruct the way of the Lord. A neutral position is absolutely impossible in this matter. We must either be with Christ or against him. Let me, then, point out some of the ways in which we hinder God's way by our example. Our lives, friends, give evidence whether our belief is real or not. To express a belief and to act as if that belief were wortbless is about the most injurious example of all. The infidel's position is consistent—he lives according to this world, because he does not believe in God—does not believe in a hereafter. There is not at all the same danger from his example as from that of the inconsistent professing Christian, because when we see a wicked man who is an infidel we say we do not want to follow him. But what about the man who professes to believe and then acts as if his belief were all false? What proof do we give to the world and to the members of our household, for this is really the test upon the sincerity of our belief? For instance, we believe in the supreme importance of worshipping God, and we lie in bed so long on Sunday morning that we cannot go to Church. We believe that the things which are seen are temporal, and the things which are not seen are eternal, and we spend pounds and pounds on the temporal things, and give, per-

haps with a grudge, a few shillings to the eternal things. We believe that the Lord gave His dying command to partake of the sacrament of His body and blood; we believe in it, and Sunday after Sunday we turn our backs upon the Lord's table. We believe that Jesus came to cleanse us from our sins —our sins of intemperance, ill-temper, covetousness, and worldliness, and then week after week we allow them to gain full influence over ourselves. We believe that Christ promised His blessing to the poor in spirit, and yet we are filled up with a sense of our own importance, and resent bitterly any slight or insult that may be put upon us. We admit that the peace-makers are called the children of God, and yet we allow our tongues to spread the story that causes heart-burnings between friends. My brethren, I draw my bow at a venture, have you felt the prick of any of these arrows between the joints of the harness of your conscience? Have you been found to say, as, God knows, I have, "Thou art the man." Oh, but we are poor navvies. No wonder the way of the Lord is blocked up with rubbish and inconsistencies, which we might remove, but we wont. God help us to have more of the spirit of Christ's great forerunner, John the Baptist, that we may make straight the way of the Lord, first by making a clean sweep of the sins of our own hearts, so shall we be workmen needing not to be ashamed.

THE LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

By the Rev. A. E. CLARKE, B.A.

Sermon Preached in St. Peter's Church, Islington, on Sunday Evening, September 16th, 1888.

"For where a Testament is there must also of necessity be the death of the testator."—Heb. ix. 16.

IF I were to say, Next Sunday evening (D.V.), I will read a will which concerns every man, woman, and child in this parish, and in every parish of the world, what crowds would come to church, what solemn stillness would reign, what eager curiosity would there be to know the amount of the legacy left, and what gratitude would be shown to the unknown testator. And yet, after all, what can earthly friends bequeath? Trinkets, deeds, papers, moneys, possessions—yes, in usufruct, to be used and enjoyed till your death, perhaps to-morrow or the next day. But, still, I repeat, were I to read such a will, I should be the object of intense interest, and the testator of undying gratitude. Then, when I solemnly affirm that the will I shall read to-night bequeaths legacies of unsearchable riches, of pardon from besetting sin, of immunity from carking care in this world, and eternal inheritance in the next, when I proceed to assert as solemnly that I am a legatee at present under the terms of this wlil, and that everybody inside, and everybody outside this church, can be too, shall I not expect the most wistful, the most wakeful, the most unwearied attention mortal man can give? You remember what fired the mob of Rome when Cæsar lay low, was the fact that in his will he had remembered the poor of Rome; and shall I not the more fire you with holy gratitude and love when I tell you that a greater than Cæsar hath remembered the poor, yea, and the rich, of the whole wide world? Shall I not render you speechless for emotion when I tell you He has done this at the cost of His life?

May the Holy Spirit witness with my spirit while I touch briefly on the three principal features of this Last Will and Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ. I shall first show that it is valid; I shall then go on to mention the terms: and I shall close by briefly pointing out some of the legacies contained therein.

I. Our text tells us, what no one would dispute, that a will becomes valid at the death of the testator, and so this New Testament is valid through the death of Jesus Christ. I find that our Lord referred to this when He spoke of the "New Testament in My blood." Now we read in Leviticus that the blood is the life, so that the New Testament in Christ's blood means the new testament for which Christ gave His life. Among countless evidences of this fact, many of which are spiritually discerned, let me choose one, and it shall be historical, so that no one here may rest in doubt. This one is the Lord's Supper. What shall we do to-night when we approach yonder table? Who tells us to do it, and how long has the custom obtained? My friends, we shall eat bread and drink wine because Christ told us to do this in remembrance of Him eighteen hundred and fifty-five years ago! And what we shall do to-night has been done every Lord's Day since the evening before the Crucifixion, A.D. 33. This is history. and we challenge refutation. Right through the dark ages and the bright ages, through storm and sunshine, through persecution and prosperity, through every section of the Church Militant here on earth, wherever our Lord's command has gone, there has His Supper gone also. Come back awhile with me to the first century, and we shall take the evidence of an enemy to Christianity to prove our case. Pliny, provincial governor and persecutor, writing to the Emperor Trajan asking advice as to the treatment of certain Christians, "whose only fault was their obstinacy" (1 Cor. xv. 58), says "that at a stated hour in the morning, a great while before day, they gather themselves together, and after singing a hymn bind themselves by a *sacrament not to commit any wickedness*." Twenty years earlier we are in Apostolic times, and I suppose no one would deny the existence of the Lord's Supper then. Historically, therefore, there is a

chain of irrefragable evidence as to Christ's death for the sins of the world; without we have proofs, within we have strongest proofs. It is the internal evidence, speaking better things than all else, which cannot be gainsaid; it is the Spirit that beareth witness with our spirit that we are the sons of God: it is the Holy Spirit alone who raises a man up from the grave of moral corruption, and sends him forth alive unto righteousness—a miracle of grace of daily occurrence—that as "Christ died and rose again for us," so should we who are redeemed by His blood, die from sin and rise again unto righteousness. *Hence* the New Testament, the New Will is valid, because our Testator died.

II. How glorious, then, to think that all the inestimable advantages accruing therefrom are ours if we but fulfil the conditions! In most earthly wills there are conditions, there are terms, more or less grievous. One man has to change his name, another has to forsake a relative, a third has to give up his home, a fourth to make yearly pilgrimages hither and thither, and in all cases there are restrictions pursuant to which legatees enjoy their legacies. But what are the condtions of this Will? Are they grievous, irksome, hard? Listen to the three conditions and judge for yourselves. They are Faith, Repentance, Obedience. The Testator says He has done what He has done that you who were dead in trespasses and sins before, may now live. Believe it. He says that you have to receive His words with all simplicity, all helplessness, even as little children. Believe it. He says that eternal life awaits believers, and eternal wrath abides on unbelief. Believe it. "Ah!" but you say, "Believe it—that's just my very difficulty; it's easier said than done! I can't believe!" No! perhaps you can't. But the Holy Spirit can make you. In fact there is a codicil, so to speak, to that effect, which meets your case exactly. It runs: "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come to you; but if I depart I will send Him unto you. And when He is come, *He will reprove the world of sin*, and of righteousness, and of judgment; of sin, because they believe not in Me." So you see, though none of us can convict of sin, the Holy Spirit in us can. He has taken and cleansed the unchaste before this, and made them whiter than the driven snow. He has cleansed the hard Atheist, and made him the soft child-like believer. He has cleansed the drunkard, and made him the sober, happy father. He has taken the swearer, the liar, and the blasphemer, and made their tongues to sing praises unto God. Assuredly He can make *you* believe! So if you are really repentant, if you have really seen yourself in the glass of God's Law and now must fain loathe yourself, repenting in dust and ashes; if you are earnestly longing to believe, kneel in faith, and reverently ask God to give you His Holy Spirit in fullest measure; and "if ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him." We need not dwell on the third condition—Obedience. For do we not know "how love doth make the willing feet in swift obedience move." Once recognise Christ as your Saviour, and you must love Him, you must obey His hests.

III. If we fulfil the terms of this Will, then we enjoy some of the benefits here, but the chiefest hereafter. They are: remission of sins, reconciliation with God, sanctification on earth, and glorification in heaven! Stay! says our worldly friend, I thought you commenced by speaking of unsearchable riches, some equivalent for hard cash, some practical advantages superior to what the world offers. So I did. To go about your business with elastic step, clear, honest eye and gladsome heart, to know no more mad regrets, to be singing for ever the song of contentment, to feel that all was well with you, come weal come woe, to have no skeleton in your cupboard, to know that if you were taken away Home, your widow and children would be cared for and loved by the Father of the fatherless and widow—Are not these some of the unsearchable riches that acceptance of Christ and His Testament confers? Are these not hard cash? And remission of sins means all this. What a legacy! Here is another: reconciliation with God. If you are not friends with God, depend upon it you cannot be friendly with yourself or anyone else long; sooner or later things will go wrong; sooner or later the sigh will replace the song; sooner or later you will find it is really hard to kick against the pricks; sooner or later you will get into the "don't care" state: then remember that here is a priceless legacy for you, *wherever you are;* for here God bids all the "don't care" people to come and let Him take care of them; here God beseeches you—unreconciled young and unreconciled old — beseeches you through us, "Be reconciled to Him."

Such salvation, sinner, say,
Will ye madly cast away?

What is the third legacy? Sanctification on earth; and this you cannot enjoy until you know by experience the meaning of the other two. What does it mean, this long word? It means just a training in holincss and lowliness all the days of our life; it means just the capacity to give up worrying, and to cast our daily dole of care upon One who careth, ah! how deeply, for us; it means anticipating Heaven while yet on earth; it means, in fine, a proving by our own individual experience how immeasurably superior are things heavenly to things earthly. Let me quote the words of one who had drunk to the dregs the cup of this world's pleasures, before he found his Saviour, an officer in the 97th regiment—Captain Hedley Vicers:—"I would not, for all the world could give me, go back to my former state, I have gained immea-

surably more than I have given . . . . in place of an aching heart, I have tasted of a peace which passeth understanding." And now we reach the *great legacy*, the everlasting one, the one which infinitely transcends all the others, I mean Glorification, I mean Eternal Life! The others take you safely to your tombstone; this leads you beyond it. Eternal Life! Eternal Life! Ay, that's the shout that will always scare away doubts, distresses, fightings, fears. If we have determined to start on our pilgrimage at once, keeping this legacy in view, the voice of the charmer will never reach our ears, charm he never so wisely, induce he never so softly, that we should yet tarry in the world with him awhile.

You may have read how the Greeks, under Xenophon, after their weary wanderings in Asia Minor, when they at last approached the coast and saw the sea, beyond whose silver streak lay each sweet home, fell upon each other's necks, and kissed each other, shouting in ecstasy, "The sea! The sea!" So may the Holy Spirit bring you all to the coast of faith this night, opening your eyes to see, after your weary wanderings, the home of endless rest beyond the narrow stream, so that ye may exclaim, in deep if silent joy, "The Will! The Will!"

A NEW-YEAR SERMON.

By the Rev. J. W. KAYE, Rector of Derrybrusk, Diocese of Clogher.

"The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God shall stand for ever."—Is. xi. 8.

THE prophet here gives us an illustration founded upon the analogy between the nature of a flower and the nature of the human body. "All flesh is grass." "The grass withereth and the flower fadeth." It is of the nature of the human body and of the flower of the field to fade away. Analogies between external nature and human life are often found in the writings of the prophets. Our Lord Himself often brought to the minds of His hearers by the use of analogies the most profound spiritual truths. How beautiful, and yet how profound are the lessons which Jesus taught from the lilies of the field. What is human glory to the glory of the God-enrobed flower? Isaiah was not unacquainted with the floral beauties of Canaan. The hills covered with stately cedars, the lower slopes of the mountains rich in vineyards, orchards, and olive gardens, and the plains luxuriating in meadows and gorgeous flowers, and fields of ripening corn. As he gazed upon the sublime grandeur and wondrous beauty of the Land of Promise marvellous analogies of the world of nature and the world of spiritual and prophetic truth filled his poetic soul. And as he was commanded he uttered them for the instruction, the encouragement, and the warning of Jewish and Gentile nations. One of these beautiful analogies we have chosen for our text. There is beauty in the flower and in the human form, but as the beauty of the flower fadeth, so the beauty of the human form fadeth away also. Our text teaches us that

I. The Beauty of this World passeth away.—"The grass withereth, the flower fadeth." This is Isaiah's dirge upon human life. How touchingly mournful are the words. A very funeral hymn. Human life is compared with a flower that bloometh for a little while and then fadeth away. What a sorrowful emblem. What a sad and depressing thought! How frail, how short-lived is the fairest flower—the breath of winter passeth over it, and it is gone. And yet, such is human life, for "all flesh is grass."

1. The Flower of the Field fadeth.—The rocks become bare, the mountains barren; the plains become desert wastes, the flowers are all gone, and the dreariness and deadness of winter covers the land. The trees are leafless, the birds are gone, and the music of the groves is no longer heard. Truly the flower of the field fadeth.

2. The Flower of Childhood fadeth.—The child of beauty, the blossom of loveliness, a little brother or a little sister, full of youthful sports, its life all happiness, and yet the breath of sickness passes over it, its steps begin to falter, it is laid on its little bed, and the flower fadeth, it passeth away—it is dead. The parents are filled with inexpressible anguish, brothers, sisters, and neighbours' children gaze on the pale face and motionless form of their companion in wonder and in awe at the mystery, called death. The old man leaning on his staff, pauses pondering why so young and lovely a child should die. But alas! the flower of childhood fadeth.

3. The Flower of Manhood fadeth.—Childhood and youth may be spared to reach man's estate, but disease stealthily comes and taints the life blood as it courses through the veins, and manhood fadeth in all its freshness and brightness and beauty. A languid weariness comes over the limbs, fear quenches the aspirations, physical strength fails, hope dies in the breast, and the once rich clear voice falls to a low, mournful tone. Then come the blanched and pallid cheek, weary days and restless nights, the heart grows weak, the breathing becomes fainter and fainter, and the flower of manhood fades—and dies. Relatives and friends follow the remains to their last resting-place, the grave is closed, and the life that was once a joyous holiday is past for ever.

> "Ah, life is like a summer rose,
> That opens to the morning sky,
> But ere the shades of evening close,
> Is scatter'd on the ground to die."

4. The Flower of Age Fadeth.—Though child-

hood should grow to manhood, and though manhood should ripen to a good old age, yet the man of years and strength shall fade. Length of days is a favour bestowed from Heaven. It may be made a blessing to us, or we may turn the gift into a curse. The grey head may be a crown of honour, commanding reverend and respectful attention. Words of wisdom grace the lips of the aged saint, and the human winter is not without its flowers. All honour to the aged and the good. But all flowers fade; the most queenly lily that ever graced the vales of Galilee, and the most royal rose of Sharon that ever adorned the slopes of the Judæan hills at last withered and died. And thus the strength of age shall decay—the cheek shall lose its bloom, and the eye its light, the firm step shall falter, the right hand shall lose its cunning, and the stalwart frame shall totter under its heavy burden; the warmth of human affections shall become chilled, the once vigorous intellect shall become clouded and dim, and every human blossom shall be nipped and wither in the frosts and snows of the human winter. Thus shall the old man die. "All flesh is grass; the grass withereth and the flower fadeth."

At the close of another year of life such solemn thoughts as these may well claim our most serious contemplation. All our faults, failings, and sins during the past year are recorded against us. Sins committed against God and man, sins of omission, neglect of duty, neglect of kindness, of sympathy and love. What a long roll of sins is against us; neglect of our souls, neglect of God and His service, neglect of prayer, neglect of our own families, coldness and indifference towards religion and all that is pure and true and good. Let us pray for forgiveness. Let us begin to serve God more faithfully. Our text teaches us that

II. The Word of God standeth for ever.—The world and all that is therein is transcient, and passeth away. Decay and Death carry all things earthly into one vast sepulchre. Nations, empires, races of men are engulphed; Nineveh, Babylon, Egypt, ancient Greece, and Rome have disappeared, and we, too, shall in our turn pass away. How humiliating to the pride of man to know that he shall fade as the grass, and that with all his pride and pomp and power he shall shortly be consigned as "dust to dust." The glory of men and nations passeth away like a weird shadow, but the word of God standeth for ever. That word is eternal truth—permanent, incorruptible, unfading, and "which liveth and abideth for ever.' It is permanent because of

1. Its own Inherent Living Power. — The word of God cannot die, for in itself is enshrined "the power of an endless life." It is higher than heaven, it cannot fall, it is deeper than hell, it cannot be shaken, it has the authority of the everlasting God and cannot be gainsaid. The drop contains in itself all the essential elements of the mighty ocean from which it came. The spark retains the essential characteristics of the pure elemental fire, from whence it emerged. Until mind ceases to be mind, until truth ceases to be truth, until God ceases to be God, "the word of the Lord" must continue. The word of God is permanent because of

2. The Eternal Work it is Accomplishing.—Whether as a proclamation, a promise, or a prophecy, the immutable word of God can never return unto him void. That for which it was sent forth must be accomplished. The word has been uttered through patriarchs and prophets of old, while in these last days God hath spoken unto us by His Son. And He who spake as never man spake, said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." The work of the word of God—the work of the Gospel of Christ is the bringing of light and truth into the dark hearts of men. Turning men from sin and Satan unto God, through Christ, by the power of the Holy Ghost. And the light and truth that shone in dark hearts here on earth will still shine in the hearts of the redeemed in heaven through endless ages. Time may fail, stars may fall, and the earth may vanish away, but the words and works of Christ shall never fail. He will gather His sheep into His fold. The word of God is unfailing because

3. It is an Attribute of His own Glory.—There is nothing impossible with God except to be untrue and unfaithful; he is "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." His faithfulness reacheth above the clouds, unmoved by time and unmeasured by eternity. The whole universe of suns and stars declares the immutability of God; Cherubim and Seraphim rejoice in His infinite perfection, and the innumerable company of the redeemed shall shine for ever in the brightness of His unfading glory. There are no real discrepancies between the word and the works of God, and only those whose vision is the weakest imagine they see disagreement. Through all the ways of God the light of truth and goodness shines in beauty, if we had angel eyes to discern it. Let us bow in all humility before His infinite power, wisdom, and goodness. Who are we that the eternal God should condescend to acknowledge us? Who are we that God should become man to redeem us? To redeem us from sin into holiness? To die on the cross to save us? We shall understand these things better by and by, when the light of the glory of God beams into our spiritual eyes, revealing the mysteries of eternity. How weak and perishing are these poor bodies of ours at the very best. "The grass withereth; the flower fadeth." But how infinite are the resources of the eternal Godhead! How stupendous are the Divine purposes! truly, "the word of God standeth for ever." How long, then, halt ye between two opinions? Choose ye this

day whom ye will serve. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. Let us serve the true and living God. And though the flower-leaves wither, yet with Christ in us the hope of glory, the seed will remain and bring forth precious fruit to the praise of God. Then the flower shall not be destroyed, but the "mortal shall put on immortality;" then shall be brought to pass the saying which is written, "Death is swallowed up in victory."

THE oldest clergyman in England, the Rev. Bartholomew Edwards, rector of Ashill, in Norfolk, who is within a month of his hundredth year, is lying dangerously ill at his rectory.

ON Wednesday, the 30th ult., the Rev. John Elliott, vicar of Randwick, Gloucestershire, entered upon the seventy-first year of his incumbency of that parish, he having been licensed to it as perpetual curate in the 30th January, 1819. Mr. Elliott graduated at St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, in 1818, and was ordained in the same year.

THE Rev. William Page Roberts, who has been prevented by severe illness from officiating at St. Peter's, Vere-street, since the end of November, was able to move to Ventnor, and is rapidly approaching convalescence. The Rev. O. J. Vignoles is in charge of St. Peter's for the present, with the sanction of the Bishop of London. The Sunday morning preacher is the Rev. T. Bonney, Professor of Geology at University College.

THE enthronement of the Bishop of Oxford took place in the cathedral at noon on Thursday, the 31st ult., in the presence of an overflowing congregation. The pressure of other duties at that hour prevented a very large attendance of members of the University; but the whole of the cathedral body and about 400 of the clergy of the diocese were present. The Mayor and Corporation attended in their robes of office. The Bishop, who was attended by the Dean and Archdeacon of Chester, and by his chaplain bearing the pastoral staff, was met at the west door by the Dean and Chapter, and was conducted by them to the choir, Psalm cxxii. being sung as a processional. The Dean then led the Bishop to the foot of the throne, and the Archbishop's mandate for the enthronement was read. The Bishop made the customary promise to preserve the rights and privileges of Christ Church, and was placed in the throne by the Dean, with the following words:—"Ad honorem Omnipotentis Dei et sanctae matris Ecclesiae. Ego, auctoritate mihi in hâc parte sufficienter concessâ, te reverendum in Christo Patrem ac Dominum, Wilhelmum, Divinâ permissione Episcopum Oxoniensem, in realem, actualem, et corporalem possessionem Episcopatus Oxoniensis, iuriumque et pertinentium suorum universorum induco, et te cum plenitudine iuris Episcopalis in hâc sede seu cathedrâ Episcopali Oxoniensi praedictâ installo et inthronizo, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen." The *Te Deum* was then sung and a Lesson read. This was followed by Handel's *Ninth Chandos Anthem*, and the service was ended with prayers and a hymn. The Bishop gave the benediction, and Psalm xlvi. was sung as a recessional. The Bishop afterwards lunched in Christ Church Hall, with the Dean and Canons and many of the clergy of the diocese.

Certain HARNESS' Cure.
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
FOR
RHEUMATISM
Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh, writes:—"*The Electropathic Belt has* **completely cured** *me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense agony for two years. I now feel strong and active.*"
Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. **Pamphlet & Advice free on application** to **Mr. C. B. Harness,** *Consulting Electrician,* the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
Only Address,
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W. (*Corner of Rathbone Place.*)
Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1889.

GRAVEN IMAGES.

ONE of the most alarming symptoms of our present revolutionary age, is the elevated positions that the anarchic forces now prevalent have invaded. In secular matters, we have Mr. Gladstone, a man who has thrice borne, and may possibly bear again, the immense responsibilities of a prime minister, recklessly excusing and evoking popular resistance to law. In ecclesiastical matters, we have Bishop King and Bishop Temple, each assisting, though on different sides, to discredit the law; the former substituting a personal interpretation of his own for that placed upon the rubrics by the Supreme Court of Justice; and the latter claiming the right, of his own arbitrary will, to close the courts against ecclesiastical suitors, both prelates alike substituting personal judgment or caprice for the impartial and authoritative decisions of law, and claiming for themselves a virtual autocracy.

The symptoms of the times are very grave; and the only safety that we can hope for is in a general uprising of all those conservative forces, which are always latent in the English character, against all who break and discredit law. We should wish to deal first with the questions that have been raised by the recent introduction, by the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, of images into the sanctuary of the metropolitan cathedral, and by Bishop Temple's resolution, that that innovation shall be submitted to in silence, and its legality pass untried. We do not propose to intrude into the lawyers' department. They will soon have to decide whether the Bishop's pretensions are in accordance with the laws of

England; and from them we can still hope for that solemn and serious treatment of a most important question, which is seldom given by spiritual authorities. We have every confidence in their impartiality and wisdom, and have no doubt that their voice will speak plainly against all anarchic pretensions, from whomsoever such may proceed. We would, on the present occasion, merely address ourselves to the previous question, whether "graven images" (to use the expressive Old Testament term) ought to be replaced in the sanctuaries of our churches.

Now, to the public press in general, this is a mere question of æsthetics. To most writers for periodicals, and to the public, for whose tastes they cater, the Virgin Mary is nothing more than Pallas Athene, or the huntress Diana, or any other virgin or non-virgin goddess; and her image is merely an effective ornament, a property (in the theatrical sense) of an ecclesiastical building, which all persons of cultivated taste ought to admire, and to which no one could possibly object, except a mere Philistine or Puritan. "Of the other saints, some," they think, "were historical characters, who possessed heroic qualities, which deserved commemoration after death, and statues erected in their honour; while others, though historically less authentic, yet represent myths, which embody moral and spiritual instruction; and thus their images convey to posterity, in a pleasing æsthetic form, the piety and wisdom of our ancestors. Their legends, and especially that central legend of Jesus of Nazareth, around which the other saintly stories have grouped themselves, have furnished a motive and impulse to numberless artists, and thus given a being to the noblest works of art. Would you banish the sculptor and the painter from the highest religious themes, and confine him rigidly to those which are secular and profane? Is not art the handmaid of religion? And does it not exercise a powerful influence in drawing towards religion the tastes and sentiments both of the vulgar and of the refined? If its influence be in some sense idolatrous, surely it is a softening and humanising idolatry; and thus better than the cold and dry and hard realities, which are all that the non-æsthetic religions have to offer? If truth has faded from our eyes, and the sweet gospel tales, which we once fondly accepted as histories, have shadowed away into moral and spiritual myths, yet may not the artist still continue to delight us with representations of their beauty, and provide us with some of those hallowing sensations, which we enjoyed in the days when we believed?" If we are not mistaken, it is under feelings such as these that artists create, and ecclesiastics erect, and congregations accept, works of art like those recently introduced into the sanctuary of St. Paul's. The reredos in that cathedral is not a monument of a reviving faith, but of a dying one. The position of Christianity in our days reminds us painfully of that of Roman paganism in those of Augustus. There is the same restoration of sacred buildings, the same bricks removed to be replaced by marble, the same profusion of decorations and statues; and the legends are being philosophised, as in that period by Terentius Varro; and our great men patronise religion from the same motives that Augustus did; and our *flamines* and *pontifices* recite the second commandment of Sinai as their predecessors of Rome did the hymns of the *Fratres Arvales*, and other portions of the ancient pagan ritual, apparently unconscious of their own unreality. Does the Bishop of London really think that a state of things like this can continue, or that he may succeed in hushing up the matter so that it may outlast his time? The present situation of religion is like that which a prophet once described—"as a breach ready to fall, swelling out in a high wall, whose breaking cometh suddenly at an instant." The foundation is undermined, and any moment the smash may come. The only possible remedy is not to keep things quiet for a time, as the Bishop of London proposes, but to return to the ways of simple veracity.

The second commandment is now treated by some of the bishops and clergy of the Church of England as an obsolete enactment which may be safely disregarded. Yet all of them continue to recite it weekly, and, in churches where the ceremonial spirit has most deeply penetrated, even daily. They add to it every possible circumstance of solemnity. Before reciting it, they proceed in procession into what they themselves call the *sacrarium* or sanctuary of the church, to the table which they call the altar, which stands in what they liken to the Holy of Holies, in which they suppose the Deity to dwell, some of them immaterially only, but others as embodied in a piece of bread. They preface their recital of the ten fundamental laws, of which this is one, by a declaration that the Deity himself is their author—"God spake these words and said." And they require the congregation to kneel on their knees, and they place in their lips the petition, "Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law." If ever a clergy were under a constraining obligation, it is the Anglican clergy to these ten laws, some of which they now treat as antiquated.

The second commandment being evidently still in force, by the daily confession of the clergy who recite it, it remains to consider what it really means. It forbids the construction of a graven image (פֶּסֶל) and of every (כָּל), likeness (תְּמוּנָה), of anything in air, earth, or water. It forbids all obeisances (הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה), to such representations, and all service (עָבַד, δουλεύειν) done to them. And it enforces this prohibition by two statements, one contained in the preceding commandment, "I, Jehovah, am thy God; there shall be to thee no after or subordinate gods before my face (אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים): and another" in the second itself, "I, Jehovah thy God, am a

jealous God (אֵל קַנָּא): and the whole concludes with a warning of the universal tendency of idolatrous worship to become hereditary, and thus perpetuate itself.

The terms of this commandment hardly require any explanation. פֶּסֶל is etymologically a thing carved or graven, but it is so constantly employed to express an idol of any kind that it is used in many places, as in Isaiah xl. 19, for an image, that has been formed by melting metal, and casting it in a mould. The images at St. Paul's are certainly to be referred to the class פֶּסֶל. And, if it were pleaded in favour of some of them that they do not come under the clause which forbids תְּמוּנָה or likeness, because they represent something that never was in sky, or sea, or shore, still they come under the category of אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים, subordinate gods. The Virgin Mary is hardly even subordinate, being *θεοτόκος*, Mother of God. The obeisances (הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה) forbidden include not merely those which express worship of a divine person, but also respect to a human one, as that paid by Abraham to the people of the land (Gen. xxiii. 17, and elsewhere): and the service עָבַד is also very general, including all *cultus* of every kind. The attribute applied to the Deity in enforcing this command is precisely represented by the English words, "a jealous God." קַנָּא is used (as in Numbers v. 14, Gen. xxx. 1), of the man or the woman who insists on the exclusive possession of his wife or of her husband. And it is in that sense that the word is used here, in exclusion of the graven image, or likeness, or of the subordinate gods of any kind, that may be set by the side of the great One—in prohibition of the obeisances, and the service, that may be offered to any except Himself.

There still remains one question as to the extent of this prohibition. Does it forbid all images and likenesses everywhere, in fact, the whole art of the sculptor, as is the case in Islam? Or does it only forbid them in connection with divine service, in such positions, in which they may possibly become objects of worship. We can imagine as possible, no other interpretation except those two. And either of them would equally condemn the Chapter of St. Paul's for erecting, and the Bishop of London for permitting, the objects of art which are now called in question. For these images are ranged in the very centre of the solemnities, at the very quarter of the compass towards which the officiating clergy habitually direct their devotions, in the very place in which they are most likely to prove a temptation to idolatry.

We may perhaps have something more to say upon the moral effects of imagery. It will suffice, for the present, to submit humbly to the public, and especially to the judges who will eventually have the decision of this case, these points:—Whether the ten commandments are not fundamental enactments in all the laws—whether canon or civil, whether common or statute? And whether the clergy are not obliged to obey the second of those laws, as well as the other nine?

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Collect for Fifth Sunday after Epiphany.

Last week's collect pointed out to us our own weakness and God's strength; to-day we are privileged to be brought into closer union with "Our Father, which art in heaven," by realising ourselves members of His Church and household. God's household consists of His children, that is those who have had power given them "to become the sons of God." This collect is the prayer of the Christian, and does not seek for temporal protection, but rather craves the higher privilege of the grace that is able to keep a soul steadfastly looking unto "the Author and Finisher of its faith." As a child appeals to a father for the means of sustenance, so do we, the members of God's household, appeal to Him for the spiritual support of which we stand in need. This collect, too, marks with rare exactness the characteristics of the Christian—the child of God, the member of His household—"that they who lean only upon the hope of Thy heavenly grace." Thus the Church points out to us that the great goal and object of our lives should be to so strive that we may be able to give up all self-confidence and self-righteousness, and trust only to the strength and righteousness of Him who is our Head.

Reviews and Notices.

"The Gospel according to St. Paul." J. Oswald Dykes, D.D. London: Nisbet's Theological Library.

These discourses on the first eight chapters of the Romans are not addressed, it is said, to scholars or divines. The author writes as a decided Calvinist, yet with moderation and fairness. No reasonings on the deep mysteries of human responsibility bring us nearer to a solution; and we close this book, feeling that all in the way of explanation is unsatisfactory. Against some views here expressed we may note that the law is spoken of in the Psalms as rejoicing the heart and converting the soul; whilst St. John says His commandments are not grievous. The grand difficulty that, while the guilt and the penalty are univeral, the remedy is yet only of partial application, still remains untouched by our author's reasonings; once he says the gift must be for all, but immediately adds the words which bring back the whole difficulty—for all, that is, who trust.

There are good, original remarks; in fact, the book seems to improve as it proceeds. A point is made by the statement that as life advances our sins often take the character of that of Adam, though this rather favours Pelagianism. We have a good chapter on the duality of the Christian's life, based on chap. vii. of the Epistle. The force of inherited tendencies is engaging attention amongst men of science; Mr. F. Galton has, by his investigations of diseased and criminal types, added much proof to the doctrine of derived sin. When speaking of latent tendencies to evil, which at times spring suddenly into full energy,

Dr. Dykes might have shown that the evil deeds of forty ancestors, some of their sins repeated from generation to generation, have created trains of evil propensities in the ground-work of our nature ; at no distant date the pedigree of each one traces from some Nero, Borgia, or Messalina, possibly from many such.

By the way, has it been noticed that man must from the outset have been the same weak creature that he now is, having the same disinclination to obey a Divine law? He yielded, as it would seem, to the first temptation. And further — a thing which is very noteworthy — it was both halves, the female as well as the male, the entire human being, which thus gave way.

Though this point is not touched upon, a kindred topic is, namely, that creation, previous to any human sin, was exposed to decay and to suffering, and is so still where man's presence has never defiled it From the beginning it displayed a scene of unfulfilled promise ; the lovely blossoms faded ; the beautiful summer gave way to stern winter ; it was under a law of *variety;* yet subjected thereto in *hope* of a perfection to be one day attained.

The writer's wise tone is shown in various places. No act of God, he remarks, can be out of relation with man's own free will. He acutely urges that the phrase "led" by the Spirit is applicable only to a self-determining creature, not to an irrational or inanimate thing, which must be driven or pushed. He shows that the Christian's mind suffers more ; its widened sensibility causes it to feel deeper pain. He allows that the great problems are insoluble. He admits that, as we are not born heathen, conversion is not of necessity marked by that consciousness of mighty change which a newly-baptized Roman felt. The object of Redemption is, he feels assured, not mere restoration of the Adamic εἰκών of God. Its remoter end is not saved men but a brotherhood of the saved. With a note of comfort against fear of final rejection the book closes.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES IN IRELAND, ONE THOUSAND YEARS AGO. By Rev. Thomas Olden, pp. 131. Dublin : Hodges & Co. ; London : Simpkin & Marshall.

AN Irish Commentary, probably of the 9th century, written between the lines of a Latin version of St. Paul's Epistles, exists in the Würtzburg Library. A selection from these glosses has been given in this book. The comments are nearly all excerpts from orthodox divines, though others, as Pelagius, are drawn from.

The philosophical tendencies of the old Irish Church are here illustrated, and we have some quaint phrases. In Romans v. 12, the gloss is, "They are not sins of the flesh which are paid for these now, whatever they may have been before." 1 Cor. xiii. 12 is explained : "It is only a part of the Godhead that I know ; or there is a part in me that knows the Godhead," this commentary explains the latter part of the verses. "We see the divine mysteries just as one sees something through a shadow." An Irish legend that Enoch and Elijah were sorrowful in heaven because their bodies were heavy, is referred to in an editorial note as the ground for the gloss of "heavy" on the words, "it is sown a natural body."

The entire commentary is already published ; the present volume is merely a set of extracts. A facsimile page of the Codex is given.

"THE CHURCHMAN," published by Malony & Co., New York, seems to be improving at a "flying-pace," and bids fair to rival in American prestige the *Guardian* of our own country. The issue for January 19th contains some very interesting statistics relating to our Universities ; and we would draw attention to a very able paper by Mr. Snowden, entitled, "Hebrew Monotheism not a Development." Its English readers cannot fail to feel a sympathy for American Churchmen of a most helpful character.

THE GOLDEN CORD, issued by the publishers of the *Christian Million*, bids fair to be a great success. In addition to being the organ of the Golden Cord Society, it has intrinsic worth—the very paper for children. Not too advanced for them, and at the same time not too childish. It is full of real interest ; and such a budget of matter for the small sum of 1d. must be worth securing.

AN EASY CATECHISM FOR MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND. By Rev. Robert Stoney, 1d. J. Charles, Abbey Street, Dublin.—Based on the Catechism of our own Church, but enlarged by much useful matter ; a few questions being directed against Roman additions. The tone is unobjectionable to any school of theologians. We have bits of explanation on the Trinity, the nature of our Lord, Church Orders, the Nicene Creed, Ember Days, and so on.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FOURTH ARTICLE.

SIR,—Will you allow me a few words in reply to "B." in your number for 2nd instant ?

1. In quoting the words about our Lord's rising from the dead, with all that appertains to the perfection of man's nature, and carrying the same to heaven, and therewith abiding till He returns, he stops at His Resurrection, leaving us to imply that the article says nothing about what His Body is and will so remain. This looks ominous.

2. He says that His Body, as it appeared on the road to Emmaus, was a changed body. This Gospel, on the contrary, says their eyes were holden. Why holden, if there was a change which their eyes could detect ?

3. The closed doors prove nothing—except the fear of the Jews, they might have been opened ; though, even if His Body did pass this door, or wall, by a miracle, this would prove nothing as to the corporal nature being changed. The same applies to the fable of His passing through the rock, though an angel rolled away the stone to allow His passage.

4. Our Lord told His disciples by touch to satisfy themselves as to the reality of His flesh, and substantial bones within. Of blood, there could be no such touch.

5. "B." denies our Lord's body to be now a natural body. I maintain that this article, as well as the Black Rubric, asserts that it is a natural body with all that appertains to the perfection of man's nature.

6. "B." seems to say that the words, "This is My Body," refer to His dead body, not now existing, so that they cannot mean that His glorified body is extended down to us materially, this, after Bishop Andrewes, is most true and catholic.

7. "B." says our Lord's spiritual body dwells in heaven. The Black Rubric says the same of His natural body. Are there two? Or is His natural body, inasmuch as it is immortal and perfect, to be called also spiritual, as Bishop Harold Browne has it?

8. Whatever St. Paul meant by "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God," must apply to flesh as well as to blood; or else it must mean that they cannot do so, except in a glorified state. At any rate, if there is no blood in the glorified body, this knocks on the head the material presence of the blood, and the Roman theory of concomitance.

9. I see a most extraordinary answer to a correspondent, "G. D." in the *Church Times*, for February 1st, who asks how could a person be poisoned by the wafer, if the whole substance is changed? But I must defer my notice of this for the present.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. & V.-G. of Kildare.

REFUSAL OF THE SACRAMENT.

SIR,—Would some of your learned correspondents kindly say, Is there any evidence, and if so, what, that our Lord administered the sacrament to Judas Iscariot at the Last Supper? The question has a very important bearing on the whole matter of Church discipline, but especially on the Plymouth controversy.

QUERIST.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—Twelve years ago Dr. Newman did what few writers live to do, or care to do. He crossed swords with himself, and endeavoured to answer arguments which, in the first half of his life he had used with telling effect against the Church of Rome.

In Vol. II. of "The Via Media,' page 220 (Pickering, 1877), there is a note which some extreme teachers in the Church of England would do well to ponder. After more than thirty years' experience of Roman doctrine, Dr. Newman expounds his view of it thus:—

"The Catholic doctrine is as follows: authorities for it shall be given lower down.

"Our Lord is *in loco* in heaven, not (in the same sense) in the Sacrament. He is present in the Sacrament only in substance, *substantive*, and substance *does not require or imply the occupation of place.* But if place is excluded from the idea of the Sacramental Presence, therefore division or distance from heaven is excluded also, for distance implies a measurable interval, and such there cannot be except between places. Moreover, if the idea of distance is excluded, therefore is the idea of motion. *Our Lord then neither descends from heaven upon our altars, nor moves when carried in procession.* The visible species change their position, but He does not move."

So wrote Dr. Newman as a Roman Catholic in 1877; and, so far from being censured for misstating the doctrine of his church, he has since been made a Cardinal. Those who complain of the concluding sentences of the Black Rubric as begging the whole question, would do well to compare those sentences with this statement of the Roman theory.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Durham, January 27th.

IS JONAH'S HISTORY REAL, OR A FABLE?

SIR,—This is a most important question at present. The same query might be applied to other events in the Old Testament—as the history of Job, the offering of Isaac, and the ascension of Elijah.* I speak of Jonah's history generally, as it is impossible to separate what relates to the fish from the rest of the narrative. Our Lord refers to both in equal terms. Both references must stand or fall together (Matt. xii. 40; Luke xi. 32).

Now, it might help us to put the right meaning upon our Lord's reference, if we could certainly know in what sense His adversaries, the rabbis, understood the story—as a bonâ fide history, or an allegory? Four alternatives present themselves. In two, our Lord and the rabbis are supposed to be agreed; in two, to differ. I will take them in order, and show that, in each and all of them, it is equally impossible that our Lord could have referred to the account as an allegory.

1. We will suppose that the rabbis took it to be fable, and that our Lord so regarded it also. In this case, He could not have referred to it as a true history, with its analogy to His resurrection.

2. Suppose the rabbis held it fabulous, while our Lord knew it to be historical. Here, He could not treat it as a fable.

3. Suppose the rabbis held it historical, whilst our Lord knew it to be an allegory. He could not, on false ground, use the historical language of the rabbis.

4. Suppose both rabbis and our Lord alike regarded it as a mere allegory. How could He treat it, to them, as historical? But I may reduce the cases to two. If our Lord regarded the history as true, could He treat it as a myth? If He regarded it as a myth, could He reduce the prophecy and the after-history of the resurrection to the level of a myth also? For consider that He fortells His resurrection, and says that it shall be like Jonah's imprisonment, for three days and three nights. If the account were a mere myth, would He run the risk of His prophecy being regarded as a myth also? Would He run the risk of the account of His resurrection being now held mythical, like that of the event which He referred to, as a type of it? Those who would make the Book of Jonah a myth, must tell in what, if anything, in it is historical. Is the repentance of Nineveh fabulous? If not, on what was it built, on Jonah's character as a prophet? What proof had they of this, unless it was his own account, or his shipmates, of the storm and all its attendant circumstances? If the miracle was believed at Nineveh, who will now call it an allegory? The rabbis held some notion that leviathan was food for the Israelites in the Wilderness. Suppose our Lord referred to the Eucharist, and said that it, like leviathan, would be our food now. Would not this make His language about the Eucharist as intangible as that of the rabbis about leviathan? As our Lord's resurrection is the keystone

* See "Jeremiah," by Canon Cheyne.

of our faith as a whole, anything that would put it on a level with a fable would shake Christianity to its base. Now, suppose that the rabbis thought the story of Abraham's offering Isaac an allegory, can we suppose our Lord tells them that in like manner the Lord God would, by the deliberate counsel and foreknowledge of the Father, be delivered up to death? Would He, by reference to a myth, endanger belief in the reality of a fact so all-important? Reliance is placed on "divers manners" of Heb. i. 1. But this refers not to various degrees of authority, but to various modes of reaching mankind—by dreams, angelic utterances, immediate voices from heaven, or impressions on the minds of the prophets (see Pearson, Alford, etc.). To quibble about whether the Bible is one book or several by different authors, means, or tends, to make us doubt the authority of some or all—to cast a doubt on a man's inspiration because of his moral defects, as of Solomon, the old prophet of Bethel, etc.—is as much as denying God's right to teach by whomsoever he will. Of course, our Lord may teach by parables as well as by reference to past history—the question is, whether He would repeat a parable as a history, and whether He would shake men's belief in His resurrection by comparing its authority with that of a recognised fable?

I do not say, or think, that those who undermine the buttresses of our faith, do so, intending to bring it down. Thus, an architect may tamper with those of Westminster Abbey or St. Patrick's. He may do so merely to show his cleverness in substituting other supports for what he is pleased to call unnecessary. But the end in both cases will be the same. The supports removed, collapse must follow.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
CAN. AND V.G. OF KILDARE.

P.S.—The orthodox Jews now regard the Book of Jonah as historical. It has been well remarked that when the Old Testament has an allegory, as that of Jotham (Judges ix. 7, etc.), there follows the explanation. Here we have a whole book speaking as a history, with nothing to prevent our taking it as such. How dangerous, mixing up history and allegory! Again, are we to suppose that the history of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba would be quoted as of equal authority with a fable about Jonah and Nineveh?

THE INAUGURATION OF THE ORGAN AT THE HARVEST FESTIVAL IN GLATTON CHURCH, HUNTS, 1888.

In Glatton Church, on this our festal day,
The well-tuned Organ pealeth forth a call
For praise to God for timely harvest gifts:
And lo! the priests and rector enter in,
And to their seats in order due proceed;
The thankful people stand before the Lord.
With breath now soft and low, now loud and clear,
Instinct with life and ruled by skilful hand
The sweet-toned music leads the christian choir,
While priests and people raise with heart and voice
The hymn of praise. The worthy rector next
Calls welcome suppliants to the throne of grace.
Again, and yet again, the breathing pipes
Pour forth the thrilling notes of prayer and praise,
While ransomed sinners sing the hymns divine.
From God's unerring and unchanging Word
Two lessons suited for the day are read:
Then speaks the priest ordained so to do,
And from the Choral part of Holy Writ
The glorious theme of heart-felt praise expounds;
The congregation hang upon his lips
With ears attent, and drink th' instructive words
Which flow forth from his mouth, distinct and clear,
Like some swift-flowing and life-giving stream.
Once more the voice of prayer and praise is heard,
That prayer is said by one of stalwart frame,
Ordained to rule in things of time and of
Eternity.* The sacred music fills
The beauteous fane, with flowers and fruit bedecked;
Those offerings unto God most High confess
That He hath given us precious food this year:
Th' inspiring notes fill every heart with joy
Awake in every breast the lay of praise:
Then midst the tuneful and melodious strains
Th' enraptured hearers quit the House of God.

C. I. G.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adamson, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Vicar of Colston Bassett, Notts.
Addenbrooke, Rev. John Gordon, M.A., Vicar of Caverswall, Stafford.
Bellman, Rev. Arthur Frederic, M.A., Vicar of Staplefield, Handcross.
Brooke, Rev. Hubert, M.A., to St. Mary's Episcopal Chapel, Reading.
Broughton, Rev. R. E., Senior Curate of Nantwich; Vicar of Prestbury, Cheshire.
Cavalier, Rev. Edward Frederic, M.A., Rector of Wramplingham, Norfolk; Diocesan Inspector in the Diocese of Norwich.
Chester, Rev, John Greville, M.A., Vicar of Shirburn, Oxon.
Cowan, Rev. G. A., Chaplain of the Wilts County Lunatic Asylum.
Garnett, Rev. Richard Craven, Rector of Delamere, Cheshire; Vicar of Settle.
Hamilton-Wilson, Rev. A. P., Curate; Vicar of Glossop.
Hare, Rev. Robert Stewart, M.A., Vicar of Beighton Derbyshire.
Lewis, Rev. Alfred Merlin, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. James's, Haydock, Lancashire.
Lomax, Rev. Ernest William, Public Preacher within the Diocese of Oxford.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Alford, Rev. Walter Goldin, son of the Rev. W. Alford, of Drayton, at Henton, near Wells, on the 26th ult., aged 43.
Brock, Rev. H. F., Vicar of Brodsworth, Canon of York, and Rural Dean, on the 31st ult., aged 69.
Colles, Rev. William Morris, D.D., Vicar of Melton Mowbray, at Melton Mowbray Vicarage, on the 1st inst., aged 69.
Humble, Rev. Michael Maughan, M.A., Cantab. and Durham, for fifty years Rector of Sutton Scarsdale-cum-Duckmanton, Derbyshire, at Sutton Rectory, near Chesterfield, on the 3rd inst., aged 77.
Miller, Rev. W. Graham, M.A., at Andover, on the 29th ult., aged 29.
Potter, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Rector of Burlingham St. Edmund's-with-Lingwood, at Lingwood, on the 28th ult., aged 87.
Spark, Rev. John William, M.A., eldest son of P. Spark, of Heathfield Road, Acton, at Beaufort West, South Africa, on the 24th ult., aged 31.
Tudball, Rev. Thomas, at 54, Hova Villas, West Brighton, on the 1st inst., aged 71.
Vigfusson, Rev. Gudbrand, M.A., Lector in the University of Oxford, Honorary Doctor Philosophiæ of the University of Upsala, of the Order of the Dannebrog, Denmark, at Oxford, on the 31st ult., aged 53.
Wood, Rev. William Cecil, M.A., Head Master of the Royal Medical College, Epsom, at Epsom, Surrey, on the 3rd inst., aged 39.

* In Church and State as Rector of Glatton and County Magistrate.

The Church of England Pulpit.

PROVIDENCE.

By Rev. Canon LIDDON, D.D.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday, December 30th, 1888.

"My time is in Thy hand."—Psalm xxxi. 17.

THE Prayer-book Version of the Psalms does not always keep so close to the letter of the Hebrew as does the Authorised Version; but it is not often less true to the general drift and spirit of the writers, and being in itself as a piece of English, much more beautiful than the Authorised Version, it enables us the better to conceive of the beauty of the original. The truth is, the Prayer-book Version was made at a time when the English language had reached the zenith of its perfection. The men of the sixteenth century had a more perfect ear for its harmony and for its resources than the men of the seventeenth. How far the men of the nineteenth have fallen below the men of the seventeenth in this respect may perhaps be gathered from the recent attempt to produce a Revised Version; but in the seventeenth century the decline had already begun. Various fancies and conceits, some of foreign origin, had made men less content with that earlier speech, so strong, so clear, so tender, which was in the mouths of our forefathers under the Tudor kings. Certainly the Prayer-book Psalter is better known to Church people than the Bible Version, and with a very little care to ascertain and to mark passages in which it fails to do justice to the original, it may still be enjoyed as they can best enjoy it who know that the purest language is the best and the fittest robe for the best and the most perfect thoughts.

These remarks are partly suggested by the text before us. The original is more exactly rendered by the Authorised Version, "My times are in Thy hand." The meaning is, that all the seasons of human life, with their successive phases of weal and woe, are in the keeping or hand of God. These are included in the less-exact but more English Prayer-book Version. Life as a whole is in the keeping of God—its joys, its successes, its failures and its close. Especially the close of life is prominent in David's thought, and therefore, although the Prayer-book Version is less true than the Bible Version, it renders the mind of the Psalmist with at least equal fulness. David's reflection was one of those which men are led to make naturally in times of anxiety, such as the successful rebellion of Absalom had brought upon David. In days of health and strength, when everything prospers and there is as yet no cloud on the horizon, it is less easy thus to make a true view. The foreground of the picture is too engrossing to permit of a more distant and penetrating survey. Consider the picture which the Psalmist gives of a class of men: "They are in no peril of death: they are not plagued like other men, and this is the cause that they are so holden with pride and overwhelmed with cruelty: their eyes swell with fatness and they do even what they lust." In days of health and strength it is difficult to think of illness as a reality with which one day we shall have to make acquaintance; we are so conscious of exuberant energy, so little apprehensive of its one day failing us as it never has failed before, that we are not disposed to heed any symptoms that tell of decay and dissolution. And in like manner, when all goes well with us, we cannot bring ourselves to think that a turning in public affairs, or failure in business, may make all the difference between prosperity and adversity. David had had early in life a long training in a school of trouble. His position at the court of Saul was full of perplexity and danger; and when his rebel son took up arms against him and endeavoured to drive him from his throne, he was less shocked and surprised than most men would have been. "My time," he said, "is in Thy hand: deliver me from the hand of mine enemies."

We may conjecture that the Psalm belongs to the early days of the rebellion, when David's cause appeared to be in serious jeopardy, and he had to fly across the Jordan. Powerful monarch as he had been, he could not but know that on a human estimate the rebellion had many chances in its favour. Absalom was handsome, with a good address, with popular manners, and the strength of the insurrection lay in David's own tribe of Judah, who probably thought it had been overlooked. It is possible, too, that David, in later life, somewhat neglected the administration of justice in person, while he cannot but have lost—and must have been conscious of having lost—moral weight with the best people in his realm by his sin with Bethsheba, and by such conduct in his family as that of Amnon, his favourite son. Although, therefore, he had no doubt of the justice of his cause, his conscience told him that he had no right to be sure that God would uphold him, and he could not but remember the prediction that evil should be raised up against him out of his own house. It might be that he might fall in battle, or linger out his remaining years in captivity and shame. The issue of the contest was beyond his own range of anticipation; but he knew that all was foreseen, and so his thoughts turned to God. "My time is in thy hand." The truth that God holds in His hand every human life, and has already fixed the

date and the manner in which it should close, belongs to the general truth that His never-failing providence orders all things in heaven and earth. God's providence is His purpose and care to preserve that order in the natural and moral worlds which He established at the creation. If we could conceive of Him as taking no care of His creatures, especially us reasonable creatures, He would be nothing to us; except as a matter of intellectual curiosity, we should not know whether He did or did not exist. If He took no care of His creatures, the attributes of goodness, of justice, of wisdom, of holiness, which we ascribe to Him, would have no meaning to us, there would be no real basis, no real sanction for morality, and religion would be an illusion resting upon sentiment; but the first lessons which God taught men were that man's Creator is also man's Ruler and Benefactor! that He is not only a Being of a higher nature than ours, but also the Rewarder of virtue and the Punisher of crime.

It is not a bad description of the Bible to say it is a history of the Divine providence, either generally or in relation to a portion of the human family. It begins with providence in its account of the creation. That account displays to man the Creator as acting with the intelligence of a Being who acts freely in what He does, who acts as He does act, to use human words about Him, with reflection, with foresight, with a view to the endurance of His work and to the happiness of His creatures. The world did not escape from Him without or against His will; but he spake and it was done, He commanded and it stood fast.

And as He was in creation so has He been ever since, so is He at this moment—the Ruler and Sustainer of all life, as well as its Author.

The popular objections to the reality of God's providence are ultimately two. Men have held it impossible for a single mind to care for every created being. A pagan at the beginning of the third century could feel and represent this. "The Christians," he says, "think that their God—inquisitive, restless, mysterious, imprudent—is to be found everywhere; that He knows all, that He sees all, even the most secret thoughts of men; that He is mixed up with everything, even with men when they commit crime; just as though His powers of giving attention would enable Him to govern the world at large, and yet to take particular care of everything! What an illusion! Nature pursues an eternal course without being interfered with by any divinity. Religious men are often worse off than the ungodly, and if the world were governed by a wise Providence the course of events would be different from what it is." We might almost suppose ourselves to be reading the pages of a modern magazine instead of listening to a third century pagan. But the objection is really atheistic without pretending to be such.

More common is the notion that attention to the minute details of the universe is inconsistent with the true dignity of God, and when this objection is advanced by uninstructed Christians, they sometimes attempt to disguise from themselves their objection to the truth that God rules all life, by distinguishing between what they call His general and His particular providence. They are willing to assign Him a general superintendence of the laws which govern human life; they cannot think that He interferes to prescribe the every-day circumstances which surround it. These are details which they consider too trifling for His notice. This is one of the excuses of the human mind for relieving itself of the sense of God's all encompassing activity. It is unworthy of Him, they say, to suppose that He can really trouble Himself, with matters of such light importance; it is enough for Him to enact general laws.

Now this conception of God's relation to man, to the world, and to life, is, in fact, anthropomorphic. A human ruler can only give attention to the general principles of his administration; he must leave details to his subordinates. But this does not illustrate his exalted position so much as it shows the limited nature of his faculties. If he could he would attend to details as well as to general principles, since he would thereby show the really comprehensive character of his intelligence. A mind which can really grasp details as well as principles is greater than a mind that can grasp only principles. Among men it is rare to find the two forms combined in perfection. The infinite mind of God is as much at home in the minutest details of His Government as in the broadest laws which regulate his procedure.

Of Providence in the sense of a particular Providence, in other words, the only Providence which is real at all, two observations may here be made. First of all, it is especially prominent in the record and teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. He insists on the doctrine as part of His revelation of the Fatherly love of God, and he finds His illustration of it in a quarter from which all fatalistic systems have most eagerly excluded it—the world of Nature. "Consider," he says, "the ravens, for they neither sow nor reap, neither have they storehouse or barn, yet God feedeth them." And again, "Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you that even Solomon, in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you?' And these examples illustrate God's care in providing for human life. At other times our Lord's illustrations explain God's care. "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear ye not, therefore, ye are of more value than

many sparrows." And if to human observers it is difficult to trace that sharp distinction that might be looked for at the hands of God in the case of the good and the evil respectively, we are taught that this very indiscriminateness is a proof of the hand of the Universal Father. When insisting that His disciples should love their enemies, and pray for those who despitefully used them, our Lord gives us a reason, "That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven," and then He points to the share which all alike have, not through the operation of a blind fate or force, but by the express decision of a loving and holy will, in the blessings of nature, "God maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."

And the second observation is that belief in a particular providence is the necessary basis and warrant of prayer. And by prayer I mean prayer in its most usual and natural sense, namely, the asking God for what we want. "Prayer is no doubt sometimes and rightly used for every kind of communion with God, for acts of faith, hope, trust, intercession, resignation, even praise, but its first and simplest meaning in all languages is a petition for what we want addressed to a Being who is able to grant it. Now prayer in its primary sense is impossible except to a believer in particular providence. A Being who should only content Himself with laws and principles, and had no eye for single circumstances and events, would not answer prayer and accordingly, in quarters where belief in God's particularising providence has been lost, people have persuaded themselves that true prayer cannot be anything but praise or resignation. Upon this it must be observed, that if such a theory holds good the apostles of Christ were unspiritual men. When St. Peter was in prison prayer was made without ceasing for him; when St. Paul is giving some final instructions to the Romans, he writes: "Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me," and then he proceeds to specify four favours which they were to join him in asking God to grant, "That I may be delivered from them that do not believe in Judea, and that my service which I have for Jerusalem may be accepted of the saints; that I may come unto you with joy by the will of God, and may with you be refreshed." Here, I say, are four specific petitions for deliverance from a temporal danger, for a particular statement on the part of the Church, for a prosperous journey across the Mediterranean, for a spiritual revival after his arrival at Rome, and for a personal blessing. Either St. Paul gave very unwarrantable instructions to His Roman converts, or else this theory of declining to offer particular petitions is as mistaken as it is unapostolic. Every prayer for a particular blessing is indeed, accompanied with the reflection that God, in His love and wisdom, may not see fit to grant it. All prayer has the tacit condition attached to it, "Thy will be done." It is scarcely necessary to refer to the practice of the Church. What is the Litany but a long list of particular blessings, temporal and spiritual? What are the Prayers for the Queen and the Royal Family? These prayers suppose that the Sovereign is such an object of God's regard that it is not wrong or irreverent to ask Him to "replenish her with the grace of Thy Holy Spirit, that she may alway incline to Thy will, and walk in Thy way: endue her plenteously with heavenly gifts: grant her in health and wealth long to live: strengthen her that she may vanquish and overcome all her enemies; and finally, after this life, she may attain everlasting joy and felicity." This surely would be wholly indefensible if God only concerned Himself with general laws. If it is right thus to follow the apostle's instructions, then prayers equally specific in their purpose might be offered for others also. It is unnecessary to point out that prayers for those in times of sickness are prayers that could not be offered without gross superstition unless God's providence in the physical and natural as well as the spiritual world were certainly true.

At this time, too, our minds and hearts are full of the event which, beyond any other, shows that the Creator has not left the world to itself. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish," and, we, each of us, may, with the apostle, claim our individual share in this supreme and most gracious act of providence. Each of us may say, "He loved me and gave Himself for me."

When David exclaims, "My time is in Thy hand," he makes an act of faith in God's providence in its bearing on himself. David means that God has already assigned him a certain measure of life, which will close at a given moment whatever be the issue of Absalom's rebellion. There are, indeed, three main causes which go to determine the length of time of every human life. Of these the first is physical. Every man has a constitution given him by God which has a certain amount of vital power and no more, which can bear a certain amount of strain and exertion and no more. When this stock is exhausted first one and then another organ gives up, and the end comes. How soon it will come is partly determined by circumstances. In one set of circumstances it is delayed; in another it is hastened; but no circumstances, no precautions, however incessant, can preserve it for ever. The day arrives when the stock of strength is exhausted, the end comes, and He who gave to each of us the bodily frame we possess, and has surrounded us with the circumstances which hedge in our separate lives, knows how long this gift will last. Not that strength of constitution is always allowed to be the measure of life. Its course is not seldom arrested by a violent death; it is cut short in battle, or by

the executioner, or by lightning, or by railway accident, or by drowning, or by the murderer's knife, or by poison taken unwittingly, or by the bite of an animal, or by pestilence that walketh in darkness, or by sickness that destroyeth in the noonday; and this sudden arrest of life affects us, as men, in a very painful degree, especially in the case of those who are cut off in their youth and strength; and yet such events might suggest to those who believe in the providence of God that there are other and more influential, although less patent, causes that affect the length of human life, causes which we now proceed to consider.

Every man has a certain work assigned him to do, and when it is done, or ought to have been done, then he has to make room for others. What that work exactly is He knows who has placed us here. In the case of our Lord, the perfect man, there was no room for question. By His death He could say to the Father, "I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do"; and again, on the cross, "It is finished." But most of us can only infer generally, and not always quite distinctly, why we were placed here, while none of us can dare to say certainly at the close of life that the work which our Maker meant us to do has been completed. Too many of us—alas!—never think of this solemn truth, that we are placed here by God, not merely to live for a certain number of years, but to do a certain work, and work which it is given to no other living being to do. No question is better worthy of the careful attention of a serious man or woman than this: "What is the precise work which I was intended to do?" It may be, in human speech, a work on a great or a small scale, though all work, however humble, is great which is done for God; it may be the saving of a realm; it may be the conversion of a people; it may be the propagation of a truth that should change the faith of human life: or it may be the waiting for many years on a single invalid, or the cleaning out a house, or shop, or stable; or ringing or answering a bell, or sewing shirts, or making matches at the East End, or selling apples or chesnuts on the Embankment. The outward form of the work matters less than the presence or absence of the ennobling motive. The highest work may be even irretrievably degraded by the absence of that purpose. But, however this may be, with each of us a day comes when the work we had to do has been done or ought to have been done, and can be no longer done, and then the end comes.

For closely related to this cause, and yet distinct from it, there is a third. Every man is here on his probation or trial; he has a certain number of difficulties to encounter, a certain number of opportunities of which he may avail himself, measured unto him by a perfect justice which will deal with him accordingly. When these difficulties have been passed, in whatever manner, with whatever difficulty, the end comes. Who can say when the last difficulty has been surmounted, or when the last opportunity has been rejected or missed? We do not know. But our ignorance does not disprove the fact. He knows who has made us, who has placed us here on our trial, who removes us when we have passed it or have failed.

We see this especially in the Gospel history, where our Lord moves about among His creatures as Divine Providence, clothed in the form of flesh and blood, putting into audible human words and visible human hands, those great rules of government which we generally infer from the course of events. Consider His dealing with St. Peter. The whole history of St. Peter's call, his subsequent fall, his ultimate restoration, his apostolic labours, his death. Or take our Lord's relations with Judas. Judas went to his own place, but not until he had again and again refused opportunities. It might almost seem that the general tenour of our Lord's relations with His apostles was disturbed in order to save the traitor. It was for the sake of Judas that a year before the Passion the solemn warning was uttered, "Have I not chosen you twelve and one is a devil?" Judas, too, had his feet washed by the Redeemer of the world. Judas heard the saying, "Ye are clean, but not all." Again there came a more direct warning while yet there was time for consideration, "One of you shall betray Me." And once more, when the unhappy apostle was in the very act of consummating his tremendous crime, there came a last word of most tender remonstrance, "Friend, why art thou come? Judas, betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?" And when the probation of Judas was over, he went and hanged himself. When Peter's was over he was crucified with his head downwards in the city of the Cæsars. But as each passed through the agony of death into the world beyond, how different was the outlook.

On the last Sunday in the year most people with any serious purpose in life take stock of the use they are making of life as well as they can. Since last December, another considerable portion of our earthly existence has gone, never again to be at our disposal. Those of us who are getting on in life cannot but think of friends and acquaintances, perhaps of many of them who a year ago were here in health and strength, and who are here no longer. To some of us not one minute has passed in the year which is now closing without bringing at least one such loss; while there are those who have parted with the parent, or the husband, or the wife, or the child, or the brother, or the sister, or the friend of forty or fifty years, who gave to life all, or almost all, of its earthly happiness. And when we think of the men whom we have known only by name and repute as living on the world's public scene, how many of those too, have paid the common debt of our kind. We look abroad to the Emperors—father and son—occupants of the most

powerful throne in Europe, and behind this long procession, ministers of State, ambassadors, generals who have conquered and generals who have failed, public men whose fame a few years since was in the mouths of every one; and we think of our own country—and here there is scarcely any department of human activity that does not miss some name that was still representing a living force twelve months ago. Parliament, the universities, the army, the bar, as well as the Church and Convocation each recalls men of distinction whose place now knows them no more. Astronomy, political economy, architecture, scholarship, literary criticism, travel, no less than theology and mental philosophy, are all poorer than they were a year since, through the withdrawal of active minds which have done much either to promote, or to illustrate, or to popularise them.

Some of these who are in our thoughts to-day were not unfrequently worshippers in this Cathedral, and, like ourselves to-day, in the former years on the last Sunday in the year. One especially may claim respectful notice, since in him we lose a symbol of disinterestedness and nobility of character which is more important to our common human life than even art, or science, or literature —the late Earl of Devon. Not often or prominently before the world, and having to contend with his full share of the anxieties and sorrows which, in fact, do so much to equalise all conditions of men, Lord Devon—simple, humble, sincere, a devout Christian—was up to the last and incessantly engaged in works of public usefulness or of private benevolence. Few men, without ever courting popularity, have commanded such general and deep respect from all classes of the community, from all sections of opinions, from those who have only judged from a distance, from those who have enjoyed even nearer intimacy; for few men have seemed to understand more practically than he the high obligations of a name which for centuries had belonged to history, to exhibit more persuasively before the eyes of a democratic age all that is most truly elevating and most Christian in the feudal idea of chivalry.

"My time is in Thy hand." If there be one thought which should take possession of our minds on the last Sunday of the year, it is surely the preciousness of the gift of time; if there be one consideration which can rebuke frivolity, which can stimulate exertion, which can kill in us the germs and the motives of sin, which can bid active virtue to grow in us, it is the consideration that our time here may be very short. We do not know that another year may be granted to us. Any one of us may have passed the line which separates the living and the dead before this day twelve months. That in such a congregation as this not a few will have done so is a matter of moral certainty. Who it may be we know not, when it may be our turn we know not. "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father has put in His own power"; but this I do say: "The time is short; it remaineth that both they that have wives be as though they had none; and they that weep as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not; and they that use this world as not abusing it; for the fashion of this world passeth away." Our time is in the hands of perfect love and perfect justice. While we have time, let us, if need be, awake out of sleep, the sleep of sin, the sleep of spiritual death. Our time is in the hands of the benevolent God. While we have time let us do good unto all men, especially unto those who are of the household of faith.

THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD:

HOW A PROPHET UNDERSTOOD IT, AND A KING EXEMPLIFIED IT.

PREACHED AT GAYTON CHURCH, NORFOLK, SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, 1887, FROM THE FIRST LESSON, BY W. A. CUTTING, M.A., VICAR.

"He judged the cause of the poor and needy; then it was well with him: was not this to know me? saith the Lord."—JER. xxii. 16.

GOD—the Infinite, the "I AM," the Almighty, the "only-Wise," the "Thrice-Holy," whose Nature and whose Name "is Love"—Creator, Father, Judge—to "know Him" must be the supreme knowledge.

To know Him: not merely to have heard of Him, or thought about Him, or "felt after" Him, but to *know* Him.

Withal many are saying, not in low places only, but in high also, places of culture and of influence, "There is no God; at least we know not any." The telescope sweeping and sounding the depths of space discloses Him not. From every department of science comes the report, there is nothing in all Nature that has not grown, is not growing, from the lower to the higher; but a Maker we do not find. Such an One may be, but our science brings us no nearer to Him.

On the other hand there be many that aver loudly, almost lightly, each for himself, "Bless the Lord! I know Him; I know the Lord."

"*He judged the cause of the poor and needy, then it was well with Him; was not this to know Me? saith the Lord.*"

What have we here? (1) Well-doing; (2) Well-being; (3) These two issuing in a knowledge of God certified by God Himself.

(1) Well-doing.

God is known—not by sight or sense. They who expect it, and are sceptics because it is nowhere found, are on the wrong track. We don't need the sages and savants of a scientific age to tell us what the old behind-the-age Bible said long ago, once and again, "No man hath seen God at any time."*

God is known—not by profession or illumination merely. Of those who make that claim most loudly, not a few fail to sustain it. "If we say we have

* John i. 18; 1 John iv. 12.

fellowship with Him, and walk in darkness, we lie." (1 John i. 6.) "Not every one that saith, Lord, Lord, enters the kingdom; but he that doeth the will of God."

So we come again to well-doing. "He judged the cause of the needy: was not this to know me? saith the Lord."

That is, the knowledge of God is not of eye, lip, or intellect, but of the heart: not speculative or emotional, but sympathetic and practical.

We know a fellow man not merely by seeing him; may see him every day, and grow more and more strange to him. Not by knowing all about him—his family, history, circumstances. But by discovering in him opinions, tastes, likings, pursuits, affections akin to our own.

So we know God when in sympathy with Him. "Josiah judged the cause of the poor." Is not this what God is ever doing? See the account He giveth of Himself in Psalm cxlvi. He that telleth the number of the stars is the same that healeth the broken in heart. (Psalm cxlvii.) The spirit of love to our fellow-creatures is the very Spirit of God. Is it the Old Testament only that says so, and not the New also? Nay, the New much more says it. "Let us love one another: love is of God; everyone that loveth . . . . knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God: for God is love. . . . No man has seen God at any time. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us." (1 John iv.) Hear also what St. Paul saith: (Eph. iv.) to "learn Christ" is to "put off the the old man, and put on the new;" and that is, in detail, to "put away lying, and speak truth" to your neighbour as to the member with you of the same body, one therefore whom you would not injure in the spirit of selfishness, but benefit in the spirit of love: to "steal no more, but to labour and be able to give to the needy": not to do harm to your fellow men by "corrupt communication," but good by "words to edification," &c.: all this by way of brotherly love and of "learning Christ."

Look at Christ. "God was in Christ." "We see the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," and lo! it is "full of grace." "He went about doing good:" "He laid down His life for us." "And ye," He says, "are My disciples, if ye have love one to another."

Religion is a life. "Not," indeed, "*of* works:" but that it may be "*unto* works which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." "If any man will do, he shall know." "The faith of assurance comes by doing."*

(2) Well-being. "*Then it was well with Him.*"

Especially when this well-doing is approved by God's blessing upon it does it minister to the true knowledge of God.

"Blessed is he that considereth the poor; the Lord shall deliver him in the time of trouble." "Let the people praise Thee: then shall the earth bring forth her increase." "Honour the Lord with thy substance; so shall thy barns be filled with plenty." Can a man thus have practised considerateness and experienced deliverance, have had praise to God and a thankful, bountiful spirit requited by prosperity from God, without a sense of knowing God springing up in his soul? "I sought the Lord, and He heard me"; "I love Him, for He hath heard me." Still more, when the blessing is spiritual: prayer answered, faith confirmed, hope brightened, love quickened, peace deepened, virtue strengthened, sin weakened. "Sin cured is sin cancelled," says Bishop Horne. Can it be thus "well with a man" from God, and that man not know God?

Such knowledge is, essentially, a growth. Slow, may be, but sure. It is a shining light, shining more and more from—who knows when first?—unto the perfect day. "I was blind, now I see," may be said of a sudden change; might be said also of a gradual one. The change is the all-important point, not the process of it. "Then shalt thou know, if thou follow on to know the Lord; His going forth is prepared as the morning."

Well-doing, especially doing good: well-being, as God's attestation of it; and so the knowledge of God by a heart in harmony and sympathy with God, and owned and crowned by God's "blessings of the heaven above and of the earth beneath," these form a cumulative, constructive, but increasing and divinely-acknowledged knowledge of God.

No royal road; no short cut. To know Christ St. Paul was content to lose all else; to know Him by the fellowship of His sufferings. (Phil. iii. 10.) "The peacemakers are the children of God; and the pure in heart shall see Him."

* Puritan saying, quoted by Bishop Ryle.

THE Archbishop of York attained the age of threescore years and ten on Monday last, his Grace having been born at Whitehaven, Cumberland, on February 11, 1819.

WE understand that Miss Alexandra Thomson, daughter of his Grace the Archbishop of York, has composed a choral service for the Holy Communion, and that in all probability it will be rendered for the first time on the occasion of the consecration of the Bishop of Chester at York Minster on the 24th inst.—*Yorkshire Post.* The vicar of Carmarthen, the Rev. Alfred G. Edwards, has been appointed to preach the sermon on that occasion.

CANON CHRISTOPHER had on Saturday last his annual missionary breakfast at the Clarendon Rooms, Oxford. This never faiis to be an interesting and even impressive ceremony. The numbers attending it were as great, or even greater, than usual. At least 300 must have sat down to breakfast, nearly one-third of the guests being heads of houses, professors, and college tutors and lecturers, and it is Canon Christopher's delight to include among his guests men of every possible shade of thought. The Bishop of New Caledonia, who was the chief speaker, gave a most interesting and also most cheering account of his work among the navvies and the native Indians included within his diocese. The latter, he said, had in the schools which he had established reached, he believed, a level of education which no other native races in America had previously attained; and this fact had furnished an immense stimulus to other native races to avail themselves of advantages which the missionaries in other districts were placing within their reach. He also spoke in hopeful terms of the work which was beginning to be done among the Chinese settlers in some of the seaport towns of his diocese. The Bishop of Oxford, who had promised to be present, was at the last moment prevented, and this was a considerable disappointment to the company; but the Archdeacon was commissioned to promise on his behalf that he would be there another year.

Certain HARNESS' Cure.
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
FOR
LADIES' AILMENTS
Mrs. CRAWSHAW, 3, Princes' Mansions, Victoria Street, S.W., writes:—"*After a fortnight's application of Harness' Electropathic Appliances the effect has been truly marvellous. For eight months my life was a terrible burden. I am now quite well again.*"
Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. **Pamphlet & Advice free on application** to **Mr. C. B. Harness**, *Consulting Electrician*, the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
Only Address,
52, OXFORD ST., LONDON, W. (*Corner of Rathbone Place.*)
Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1889.

THE COLONIAL EPISCOPATE.

ONE of the most encouraging features of the present day, with respect to the Church of England, is the devotion which is shown by churchmen living in distant lands to their Mother Church. The tide of emigration is rapidly rising; year after year sees shiploads of emigrants leaving our shores, and whatever may have been their past history they seem to cherish feelings of respect and love to the Church of their fathers. We have also seen a further extension of true missionary work in heathen lands. There are at present between eighty and ninety Colonial and Missionary Bishops, out of which number some twenty dioceses have been formed since the year 1870; and, if Church-work progresses during the next ten years at the same rate that it has done during the last ten, we may expect a much larger concourse of bishops at the next Pan-Anglican Conference. All this is most cheering, and shows us that the Church of England is a living, energizing power, not only in this land, but in distant countries. It is quite true that other bodies have done a great deal to help forward Mission work; the Congregationalists in Madagascar—and we believe the Wesleyans in the Fiji Islands. Not long ago, too, we heard of a missionary and his wife belonging to the Primitive Methodist body being martyred in Central Africa, and if we were to examine all the records of missionary work in the past, we should find that there is a halo of glory, not only around the lives of such men as Dr. Livingstone, Dr. Moffat, Bishops Selwyn, Mackenzie and Patteson, but of others who have laboured on in faith and patience, their work not the less real. Yet the world has known little of them, but they have entered upon their reward, having been faithful witnesses, enduring hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ.

The ideal which the Church of England has set before herself is this, viz., that when a mission is started it should be placed under the care of a bishop, who shall have authority to confirm, ordain, and do all other acts which pertain to the Episcopate. And this is what was done in the early days after St. Augustine had settled at Canterbury, he planned the bishopric of Rochester, and Justus was consecrated its first bishop. So, too, in the North, the work was under the superintendence of the bishops, such as St. Cuthbert at Lindisfarne, St. Aidan, St. Walford, and others. This ideal is very beautiful, the bishop with his clergy, meeting him from time to time, to take counsel and devise plans for their work; the cathedral as the home, the centre from which proceeds the authority, and, at the same time, the home of the mission, as Iona was to St. Columba, Lindisfarne to St. Cuthbert and St. Aidan. And in every Colonial diocese there is to be found a cathedral, no matter how humble and meagre; but this cathedral, though rarely to be compared with the stately fanes of our own beloved land, is still a permanent witness to the missionary efforts of our Church in remotest regions.

But there is also a dark side to the picture. When we turn to the pages of some Diocesan Calendar, or Churchman's Almanac, we find that there are upwards of twenty or more retired Colonial bishops resident in England at the present time. We do not deny but that some of these men have done great and noble work for the Church in distant lands. And when worn out by exposure and hard work, we do not begrudge them an honoured old age, spent in peace and retirement. But we *do* object to bishops going out for a few years, to be styled "My Lord Bishop," and then almost immediately on their return to find them ensconsed in some snug rectory as beneficed clergy in England. We have no objection to these men personally, but we *do* object to their being allowed after a short episcopate to come back to this country and to step into some nice country living, which might well be occupied by some hard-worked town clergyman who requires rest. Sometimes it happens that domestic matters require them to come home, but we question whether a living would be found for a clergyman who had given up prospects in England to labour in the mission field—rather would it be the case that he would have to wait his time, the absence from England having cut him adrift from those chances of promotion which he might have had if he had not gone abroad. We do believe that there is a feeling in the minds of Churchmen against such a system, and if it is allowed to continue, it must

eventually dry up the source of a great deal of that liberality which is now shown by Churchmen towards the Colonial Church. On the other hand, we have in the Church men who have spent the greater portion of their life in the mission field, *e.g.*, the Bishop of Guiana who was consecrated in 1842, or the Bishop of British Columbia who was consecrated in 1859, or the Bishop of Fredericktown in 1845. These are noble exceptions, and show the intensity and devotion to the cause of truth and love for the Church. We greatly desire to see the Church put forth all its latent strength to enable her to accomplish her mission both at home and abroad.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Collect for Septuagesima Sunday.

How often are we reminded by the prayers of our Church of our sin and God's mercy! How frequently does she bid us bear in mind our own weakness and our Father's strength! Such warnings and exhortations are very needful to all of us; would that they made a more lasting impression! And now that we are leaving behind us the triumphant period of our Blessed Lord's manifestation, and approaching that season which recalls to us all the exceeding "sinfulness of sin," it behoves us to reflect anew upon *our* part in this matter; to bring ourselves face to face with the fact that it was for *our* sins that Christ our Lord was pierced. Few, if any of us, realize the persistant, entangling power of sin; we require very little teaching to imagine the horrors of bodily imprisonment; no telling at all sometimes to recognize ills of the body; and yet all the words of the Preacher fail to convince us of our spiritual bondage; the most eloquent pleadings of God's own Word cannot persuade us of our soul's grievous sickness. Unlike those few rare, pure souls, such as the Little Schoolmaster Mark, we fail to perceive the discrepancies between our creed and our character. We feel no incongruity in our profession of Christianity and our practice of worldliness. Let us pray that our eyes may be opened; that our spiritual sensibilities may be quickened, that we may perceive the galling chains of sin, and long truly to be free. When we attain to *knowing* the power of sin, when we, in our inmost hearts, no longer doubt that we *are* "justly punished for our offences;" then only shall we long for the great deliverance which Christ has procured for us, and which is ready to be exercised on our behalf, *when we once feel the need of it.* Having understood what sin has *meant for us:* having sought and obtained the redemption which was wrought for us, then we can reach the higher knowledge that it shall all tend to the glory of God, we shall appreciate the highest aim in life, an aim which transfigures the commonplace, which elevates the "little things" and which transforms the "daily round, the common task" into bright opportunities of doing faithful service to our Heavenly King.

The Rev. J. T. Bingley, F.C.O., formerly curate of St. Stephen's, Sheffield, and now of Worksop Abbey Church, has been created a Licentiate of the Royal Academy of Music.

IRELAND SINCE THE UNION.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D., Warrenpoint. Author of "Ireland since the Reformation," "The Church of St. Patrick," "The Geraldines," etc.

(*Continued from page* 46.)

CHAPTER XXIV.—(*continued*).

Why did the Roman Catholic clergy join openly in the recent movement? Did they hope to be supreme in an Ireland governed nominally by Messrs. Parnell, Davitt, and O'Donovan Rossa? Did they hope to humiliate Protestant England, and break down her prestige? Were they leaders, or led? Was it the spleen of a priesthood drawn from a lower class against *another class*, that other class differing in religion as well as in culture and position? We have stated the case, we leave our readers to answer the question. On one side now stands the Church of Rome *as a Church* pledged to Mr. Parnell; on the other side stands, united in solid phalanx as they have never stood before for centuries, *the whole Protestant population*, of every denomination, reinforced by a powerful contingent of loyal Roman Catholics. Will England use her armies to compel the loyal minority—*two millions* of her faithful fellow-subjects to submit to a rule they abhor? We do not believe it: but the future is gloomy and perilous, and our only confidence is, that "*The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth.*"

Take another case, and with it we shall leave the subject:—

"The Rev. Laurence Farrelly, C. C., Arklow, and the Rev. Michael Clarke, two Roman Catholic clergymen, were prosecuted at Arklow under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, on the 14th August 1888, on a charge of unlawfully inciting certain persons to take part in a criminal conspiracy to induce certain persons not to deal with Mr. John O'Connor in the ordinary course of his trade, business, or occupation. The magistrates convicted the defendants, and sentenced them to six weeks' imprisonment each. A case was stated in the Exchequer Division, and three judges confirmed the sentence. The Lord Chief Baron said, in giving the decision—'The two defendants, it must be remembered, were Roman Catholic clergymen. They both addressed the meeting, and the person who spoke secondly endorsed the words of the first speaker, so that the words used by one must be taken to be the words of the other.' Take the speech of the Rev. Mr. Farrelly. He said—'My friends, it will not do if you don't hunt the landgrabber and hoot the landlord exterminator. As long as you don't make the place hot for those parties, so long will they reign and rule in your midst. Why would you give your money to your enemies? It is treason, I think, for any English person to sell ammunition to a Power at war with Great Britain. Therefore, it is treason to the Irish cause for you to give money to anyone who is not united with your cause. Let him be Protestant or Catholic, and if he be not united with me, none of my money will he ever possess.' So it was idle to argue here, as had been argued by counsel in the desperation of the case, that the words used by this gentleman were words merely expressive of disapproval of the particular conduct of Mr. O'Connor. The reverend gentleman plainly told

the people to make the place hot for these parties, for so long as they did not make the place hot for them so long would they reign and rule over them. Consider who was the person who spoke language of that description. He was a Roman Catholic clergyman. He was addressing the people, not alone on the subject of the law of the land, but he was referring also to the law of God, of which he was the sacred exponent, and to whose words, as the exponent of the moral law, the people were entitled, and indeed bound, to give reverence almost as if he were the Deity whom he represented. With what subject was he dealing? He was dealing with a question of justice, with a question of truth. And here they found the anointed priest of God, who from his pulpit on Sundays inculcated upon his parishioners the paramount duty of charity and justice to all, telling the people that they ought, by combined action, to boycott O'Connor, that they ought to join in resolutions for carrying out that object, and make the place too hot for land-grabbers.

. . . . . .

"But in the case of the speech delivered by this reverend gentleman there was an additional element involved, not merely a question of the law of the land, but also a question of the moral law; and this reverend gentleman, speaking with infinitely more authority in reference to faith, morals, justice, and truth than any judge could pretend to speak in reference to the law of the land, tells these poor people, in effect, that all these things were right, that all these things were just, that all these things were in accordance with the law of the Church and the law of God. He told them all this with the authority of a priest of the Church—not only told but advised that these things should be done. But he might observe that the court were not in this case necessarily to consider whether the influence which these gentlemen exerted would effect the object they had in view. The question was whether it had that tendency, and it had nothing to say to the matter whether the undue influence that was exercised was sufficient to accomplish this purpose or not. He now came to the second speech—that of the Rev. Mr. Clarke. Speaking of O'Connor, the Rev. Mr. Clarke said—'He had been working like a mole burrowing in the dark. It is time that John O'Connor and his work should be shown forth. He has walked too long without anyone knowing of his foul deeds. His name is execrated in the county Wexford already. Look at the farms that have been laid waste, look at the children that have been ruined and sent to desolation by John O'Connor. It is time, then, that John O'Connor's name should be held up in the full glare of public opinion. He has given a reason lately for evicting Thomas Waldron. The priests interfered for Tom Waldron. The parish priest, deserving the veneration of all this country, and I, interfered; but he would not listen. Oh! he says he won't allow himself to be priest-ridden. Oh! yes; so long as he could evict the people, so long as he could grab the farms, without the priest's interference, he was not priest-ridden then; but now, when the priests stand in between the ruffian and his victim—when now the priests stand in—he says stand off; he suddenly finds that he is priest-ridden. Well, with the blessing of God, it is dangerous for him to knock his head against the priests, and he will know that before we are done with him. Oh! yes; O'Connor does not want to be priest-ridden; but to the rackrenter O'Connor, the exterminator O'Connor, the evictor O'Connor—*a day for him may be when he would be glad to see the priests, and when he would be glad to give all the farms he has grabbed to see a priest; and God knows the priest may not be with him then.* Well, now, is John O'Connor to continue this work with impunity? Very well, your cheering to-day and your approval and your standing in the rain will not stop John O'Connor; but if you say that Waldron must get his farm again. (Cheers.) He appears at present to be in a state of desperation. To-day he is like a mad bull hitting his head against the walls of the people, but he will break his horns.' That was to say, 'I do not mind cheers, but the action you must take must be such as to be effective.' He goes on to say, 'We cannot get at O'Connor, because he does not want to put landgrabbers into these farms. He wants that land for himself and his bullocks. Very well. We cannot quarrel with the landgrabbers, for there are none; but we know who can herd the bullocks for him. He cannot leave his office in Kevin Street and come down to herd those bullocks himself. Very well. We are not bound to deal with that herd either. He must stock that farm, and there is no law that binds us to sell him our cattle, or that obliges us to buy cattle from him. There is the way to meet those fellows, and your cheering will not do.' That is to say—John O'Connor is not going to put his lands into the hands of a tenant. Therefore, there is no good in attacking his tenant; but he must have a herd; he must have cattle on his lands; he must buy and sell cattle; and we will refuse to buy from or sell to him. And the magistrates were, in his opinion, entitled to infer that any person who dared to deal with him would be prevented by boycotting."

CHAPTER XXV.

"The Church of Ireland."

We shall not dwell upon the history of the Church of Ireland since Disestablishment. It is too soon to criticise failure with severity, or to boast confidently of success. The results of Disestablishment have not been what the enemies of the Church fondly expected, and loudly predicted. The Church of Ireland, as a voluntary system, has had serious dangers to face, and in all likelihood may have stormy waters and quicksands to battle through in the not distant future; but she has been braced into life and energy by Disestablishment: and those who have seen her emerge from that trial will hardly despair in future emergencies. Disestablishment has drawn closer the bond between the clergy and laity, but it certainly has not tended to promote union between the Church and Protestant Dissent. The tendency is rather in an opposite direction. As a Voluntary System, the Church of Ireland cannot afford to make weak-kneed concessions, to Rome on the one hand and to Dissent on the other, and the result is that a sound, healthy tone is beginning to be more and more observable in our religious debates. We have, of course, drawbacks to contend against. Voluntaryism rather tends to produce what may be described as "posing for effect." It encourages "clap-trap" oratory and "touting" for votes; but, on the whole, these evils have been kept within bounds by the good sense of clergy and laity alike.

The finances of the Church have been carefully worked up, and the Sustentation Fund placed, so far as circumstances admitted, on a secure and efficient

basis. Bishoprics have been endowed with incomes not indeed excessive, but for a voluntary Church reasonable. An excellent fund for the widows and orphans of the clergy has been established ; cathedrals have been restored at immense cost ; churches have been built or repaired, chancels erected ; glebe houses built or improved ;—everywhere throughout the length and breadth of the land earnest efforts are being made to kindle the zeal and quicken the interest of the laity in the work of the Church, and if our Church be not now a wealthy organisation, it is at least *a living one*, welded together in the united bonds of a common purpose and a common interest.

The Church of Ireland has already done much to repair the injury inflicted by Disestablishment, but much remains to be done. The Representative Body has drawn up a superannuation scheme for the clergy, but it still remains to all intents and purposes a mere "paper scheme." This is likely to bring, in the future, shame on the Church and suffering on the non-annuitant clergy. The Presbyterians and Methodists, wise in their generation, have suitable provision for such cases, but our Church is content to leave her disabled clergy to such chances as time may bring forth. It is not wise to wait until the necessity for such provision has actually arisen. It is still more unwise to set up schemes based on "charity" lines, and whose administration can be controlled by diocesan or local cliques. The work should be undertaken by the Church, directed from a central source, and should proceed on principles of universal application. This matter becomes still more important from the fact that the incomes of the clergy are in many dioceses totally inadequate. When the landlords sell out their properties to the tenants, the future of the Church will be gloomy in the extreme. In one diocese, standing, perhaps, in the third rank in Church population, the average clerical income is less than £150 per annum. We have said enough to indicate where neglect of precautions may prepare a "burning question" for the not very distant future.

The next point we shall notice has reference to the system of election to parishes. The present arrangement seems to bear hardly on men of experience, as the Boards of Nomination almost invariably select young and active men, passing by the elder clergy. Of course, the men appointed to parishes under such circumstances cannot be blamed, and the Parochial Nominators can fairly claim to have consulted for what they thought the interests of their parish ; but the young men must in turn grow old, and the prospect of receiving similar treatment may well supply them with food for reflection.

It is easy to point out such a blemish, but to suggest a remedy is by no means so easy, and it seems likely that the cure of this evil must be left to time and to the good sense of the lay members of our communion. The Board of Patronage consists of the bishop, two clergymen, and one layman, representing the diocese, and three laymen representing the parish. On the whole, it is probable that the present has given as much satisfaction as any other system of election would have done.

We shall close with a few remarks on the Title of the "Church of Ireland" as our recognised designation. It may be well, however, to bear in mind that, while we recognise the importance of the admission by the State that the Church of Ireland is our legal title, yet, in point of fact, the validity of the title does not rest on the recognition or non-recognition of it by the State, but on historic facts which the State cannot alter and which no action of the State in the future can affect :—

"The Church of Ireland, on submitting to the Pope, was invested with certain temporalities by Henry II." Again : "The Church of Ireland, on renouncing the Pope was confirmed in its temporalities by Henry VIII. If the investiture were valid, there is no reason for objecting to the re-investiture. The admission and the renunciation of Papal Supremacy were equally essential or equally unessential things, and if the Church survived the one, we may be led to believe that it was not annihilated by the other. There was no disruption of continuity at the Reformation (the adoption of the changes then made by the bishops and clergy as a body having the effect of preserving the derivative character of the priesthood, and maintaining the requisite unity of organisation). These circumstances sufficient (as they would be) to prove the continued Catholicity of the Church, are abundantly conclusive for its continued identity as a legal and constitutional incorporation." (Phelan.)

At the same time it is important to notice that the name "Church of Ireland" is the title uniformly applied by the Legislature to our Church : see 28 Hen. VIII., c. 5, 17 ; 18 Car. II., c. 6 ; 6 Geo. I., c. 3 ; 14 and 15 Vict., c. 72, Act of Union : Irish Church Act, 1869, ss. 1, 2, and 69 ; Marriage Act, 33 and 34 Vict., c. 110. The Church of Ireland and the Roman Catholic Church are the only communions which territorially embrace all Ireland, but of these the Church of Rome specially disclaims any bounds of country, therefore she cannot dispute the title, though she has never ceased to plot against the right of the Church of Ireland to retain it.

In 1885, Mr. Hugh Holmes, M.P., Attorney-General, and Mr. John Monroe, Q.C., Solicitor-General, reported officially to the Lord-Lieutenant "that this matter has been practically settled by the Legislature, and that the title of the Disestablished Church in Ireland is 'The Church of Ireland.'" Had the attempt to deprive the Church of its title been persisted in, it is highly probable that it would have evoked a more bitter resistance on the part of both clergy and laity than was offered to the apparently more sweeping measure of Disestablishment and Disendowment.

The Church, whose teaching is in accordance with Holy Scripture, and with the Primitive Church in her best and purest days, whose standard of faith differs in no material point from that of the Church founded by St. Patrick, whose succession of Orders has come down unbroken from St. Patrick to the present time, whose ministrations are daily in operation without clamour, or truckling to sedition, or violence, from the Giant's Causeway to Cape Clear ; whose very existence in the face of tremendous odds is the strongest proof of her Divine mission, and the surest earnest of her ultimate triumph, such a Church may not only claim to be the Church of Ireland, but may go farther still, and claim to be the one Church which in Ireland most truly represents the "One Catholic and Apostolic Church."

We cannot better close our remarks on this subject than with the words of the Bishop of Derry, in his recent address to the Churchmen of his diocese :—"Distinct we shall continue : distinct from Rome ; distinct from Calvinism. But it will be the loving distinctness of truth, not the sharp, thin distinctness of a sword-edge. And we shall have more and more

of unison of spirit with all that is honest and true in this now divided land—with the noble-hearted ministers of the Protestant communities around us, who have borne witness in the face of England, to loyalty and honesty—with the tens of thousands of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen whose voices may be overborne for a while, but who are inwardly with us heart and soul. They will know that in things religious we differ from them, and why; but they will remember that we never insulted their convictions by abuse, and they will judge us without prejudice, because we shall have spoken to them and of them without passion, 'knowing that the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.' Nothing, then, can be of more priceless value in this distracted land than a Church of conciliation like our own, if only it be filled with the life of Christ, touched by the truth and sweetness of His spirit. Such a Church will not be High, or Broad, or Low; or, rather, it will be all three at once. It will be High in its view of its own functions, and of the reality of sacraments, because behind that is the conviction that the living Lord lives and works with us. It will be Broad because it fears no truth, and is wilfully blind to no wisdom. It will be Evangelical, because it moves in that sphere for which even Christendom or Christianity is a cold equivalent, since One Person absorbs all and permeates all, 'Christ, who is all, and in all.'"

THE END.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." February, 1889. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

DR. KING'S paper on "The Hallel" is the best in the February number of the *Expositor*. It is very interesting, though too fanciful. It is very far-fetched, for instance, to see any fulfilment of Psalm cxvi. 4:—"Anguish and grief (alone) I find, then I call on the name of ÀÀ; Oh now, ÀÀ, deliver my soul;" in our Saviour's prayer, "O my Father, if it be possible let this cup pass away from Me, nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt." And the symbol—so Dr. King calls it—ÀÀ, for Jehovah, is to us utterly horrible. It brings the sublime perilously near to the ridiculous. Let us stick to the old Jehovah, which is, by now, an English word—though we quite admit it is not, and never was, Hebrew—and not strive after the merely pedantic accuracy of awful words like Yahweh. And ÀÀ is not even a word at all, its letters can, moreover, be pronounced in many different modes. Nor can we approve of all Dr. King's emendations. For instance, "They came about me like plagues" is wrong, to our thinking, not because דְּבָרִים could not be read instead of דִּבְרִים, but because it is so flat; it is not *poetry*. It is heresy of the deepest dye to turn poetry into prose.

Professor Davidson defends himself against Professor Bruce's attack on his interpretation of Heb. ii. 9. And Professor Bruce continues his articles on the Epistle to the Hebrews; but, in truth, we found both of them a little dull this month.

Dean Chadwick has an interesting paper, called "The Group of the Apostles." It might have been called, "The Naturalness of the Apostles." There has at times been a tendency to magnify the Apostles as almost perfect men, and at other times a tendency to depreciate them as strangely stupid men. Dean Chadwick shows how *naturally* they acted, and rightly remarks that what is written about them authenticates what we read of Christ.

Professor Ramsey contributes a paper on "Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia," which is full of information. Dr. Delitzsch defends his Hebrew New Testament; but we do not quite understand that it has been attacked, except by an anonymous writer in the *Quarterly Record* of the Trinitarian Bible Society, who quotes "A Jewish Opinion." Is this self-defence wise? We think not.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

JONAH'S HISTORY.

SIR,—I should like to commend to Canon Crosthwaite's consideration the following extract from the Introduction to the "Song of the Three Children," in the supplementary volumes of the "Speaker's Commentary."

"We have to bear in mind a fact familiar enough to students of the Talmudic and Midrashic literature, though apparently unknown to many expositors of Scripture, whose minds conspicuously lack that *orientation*, which is an indispensable preliminary to a right understanding of the treasures of Eastern thought—I mean the inveterate tendency of Jewish teachers to convey their doctrine not in the form of abstract discourse, but in a mode appealing directly to the imagination, and seeking to arouse the interest and sympathy of the man rather than the philosopher. The Rabbi embodies his lesson in a story, whether parable or allegory, or seemingly historical narrative; and the last thing he or his disciples would think of is to ask whether the selected persons, events, and circumstances are in themselves real or fictitious. The doctrine is everything; the mode of presentation has no independent value."

PRESBYTER.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

SIR,—I have only just read the letter in your issue of the 2nd inst., signed "A Member of the Dublin Synod." That there is a Guild in Trinity College no one acquainted with the Divinity School or the Theological Society can deny. I for one am very glad that there is such a guild there. I have seen its rules, and I think no genuine Churchman could possibly find fault with a single one of them. Their end and object is to promote personal piety amongst the young men who are preparing for the sacred ministry of our Church. The copy I have before me does not contain a word about celibacy. If there was anything wrong in those rules I am sure the learned Provost and the Divinity Professors, who, I presume, are as sound Churchmen as the member of the Dublin Synod, would have condemned them; but, so far as I am aware, they have met with their tacit approval. I was present at the debate on the paper read by Mr. Ellison, when the Rev. Ernest Wright (son of Dr. Wright),

described as "one of the ablest champions of Protestantism," spoke in its favour, and I must say a weaker defence I never heard. My impression when I left the meeting was that the arguments brought forward by the writer of the paper, and described as "hard nuts" by the member of the Dublin Synod, were very easily cracked, and, indeed, crunched, and this appeared to be the opinion of the chairman, Dr. Gwynne, our Regius Professor of Divinity, who, in summing up the debate, very effectually disposed of Mr. Ellison's arguments—arguments which our American cousins might describe as "Chesnuts," viz., exploded fallacies.

A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

THE POLICY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME IN IRELAND.

SIR,—The following are illustrations of the tactics pursued in Ireland just now by the Church of Rome, and deserve attention from the readers of your journal.

On Sunday, February 3rd, 1889, when District-Inspector Martin went to arrest Rev. Mr. M'Fadden, P.P., of Gweedore, he was brained with clubs at the very door-step of the priest's house.

Derrybeg chapel, within the precincts of which the murder of District-Inspector Martin took place, has witnessed many exciting scenes in which the Rev. Mr. M'Fadden was the principal figure. He was not present, however, at the last notable event that took place there. This was the blasphemous funeral service and procession "in honour" of Patrick O'Donnel, the murderer of Carey. It is believed that the occurrence could not have taken place without the sanction of the parish priest, and he has never condemned it. He did not take part in the proceedings, his curate, the Rev. Mr. Nelis, who is still at Derrybeg, being the celebrant on the occasion. It is exactly four years since the same people who attacked and murdered District-Inspector Martin "honoured" another murderer's memory by carrying a coffin "draped in black and mounted in rich lace," and bearing a wreath of immortelles, to the chapel, where a service was held, and £35 collected towards the erection of a monument to the murderer. It was the Rev. Jas. M'Fadden who afterwards acted for the Misses Ford and Mrs. Byrne in the erection of a monument in Glasnevin, which the Rev. gentleman undertook would be "a credit" to the "dear ladies of the O'Donnell Memorial Committee."

United Ireland gravely excuses the murder of District-Inspector Martin, because forsooth the arrest took place on Sunday when the priest had celebrated "the tremendous sacrifice of the Mass."

What would be the outlook in an Ireland governed by Home Rule?

The following extract sums up the opinion of the Chief Secretary, Mr. Balfour, on the conduct of the Irish priesthood: speaking on February 2nd he said, in Dublin:—

"A great French writer has said that every nation in Europe has been formed by agreeing to forget and agreeing to remember. Ay! by agreeing to forget the things that ought to be forgotten, and agreeing to remember the things that ought to be remembered. But your Irish 'patriot' and your Irish leader—he forgets the things that ought to be remembered, and remembers only the things that ought to be forgotten. There are persons who appear to think that they can banish morality and save religion—that they can advance the interests of their church by throwing overboard all that makes any church worth having (hear, hear), who appear to think that a State may be built up upon dishonesty and disorder (hear, hear). Let them take a lesson in time. They are now sowing the wind; but if their political castles in the air should ever be realised, they it is who will reap the whirlwind (hear, hear); for if history teaches us any lesson whatever—if any conclusion may be drawn from the experience of nations and the experience of ages—it is this, that no stable political system ever yet was founded upon fraud, upon violence, and upon mendacity."

THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bardsley, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Huddersfield; Rural Dean of Huddersfield.
Brunskill, Rev. N. R., M.A., Incumbent of Ahascragh, Co. Galway; Chaplain of Kenure, Co. Dublin.
Burgess, Rev. W., Incumbent of Parkfield, Middleton; Surrogate for the Diocese of Manchester.
Carylon, Rev. Hubert Edward, B.A., Rector of St. Just-in-Roseland, Cornwall.
Evans, Rev. T., Rector of Syresham, Northamptonshire.
Fison, Rev. Charles Frederick, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, Lower Nutfield, Surrey.
Gilbanks, Rev. W. F., Rector of Great Orton, Carlisle; Organising Secretary for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel for the Archdeaconry of Carlisle.
Griffith, Rev. A. H., Curate of St. Mary's, Scarborough; Rector of Lockington, near Beverley.
Hall Hall, Rev. A., Rector of Cheriton, Shorncliffe; Rector of Chevening, Sevenoaks.
Harrison. Rev. J. G., Sole Charge of Papworth St. Agnes, St. Ive's, Hunts.
Kealy, Rev. Arthur G., M.A., Chaplain to the *Severn*.
Kemp, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Birstal; Rural Dean of Birstal.
Kirby, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Barnsley; Rural Dean of Silkstone.
Landon, Rev. Horace R., Vicar of Leavenheath, Colchester.
Lorimer, Rev. J. H., Vicar of Oxenhall-with-Pauntley, Gloucestershire.
McNulty, Rev. T. J., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Steeton, Leeds.
Manley, Rev. W. G., M.A., Curate of Leeds; Bishop's Vicar to the Bishop of Adelaide.
Morris, Rev. J. W., M.A., Curate of St. Cuthbert's, Wells; Perpetual Curate of Henton, Somersetshire.
Morton, Rev. Henry, Rector of St. Stephen's, South Shields; Vicar of Brompton, Northallerton.
Newham, Rev. William Leighton, M.A., Vicar of Aldworth, Berks.
Newham, Rev. Charles Spencer, Curate of Halsall; Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Prestolee, Manchester.
Oliver, Rev. W. R. H., Curate of St. Saviour's, Birmingham; Vicar of St. Peter's, Birmingham.
Pennefather, Rev. Canon, Vicar of St. George's, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Peirce, Rev. David, B.A., Vicar of Thatcham, Berks.
Reeve, Rev. Edward J., Vicar of Fleetwood; Surrogate for the Diocese of Manchester.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Dalton, Rev. J. E., B.D., for thirty-seven years Rector of that parish, and formerly Vice-President of Queen's College, Cambridge, on the 7th inst. at Seagrave, in the 82nd year of his age.
Hopkins, Rev. Favill John, for twenty years Vicar of Caxton, and eight years Rector of Conington, Cambs, at 54, Regent-street, Cambridge, on the 5th inst., aged 67.
Rangely, Rev. I., B.A., at Culvert House, Darwen, Lancashire, aged 41.
Shirreff, Rev. Robert St. John, Rector, at the Rectory, Woodham Ferrers, Essex, on the 10th inst., aged 74.
Thomas, Rev. Henry Daltry, at Longdon Vicarage, Tewkesbury, on the 6th inst., aged 41.

The Church of England Pulpit.

"THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM."

By the Rev. Canon RAWSTORNE, M.A.,
Vicar of Penwortham, Preston.

Sermon Preached on Behalf of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, at St. James's, Paddington, on Sunday Morning, February 10th, 1889.

τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας.—Matt. iv. 23.
τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ.—Mark i. 14.
ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.—Luke ix. 2.

THIS is stated to have been the first subject of our Saviour's preaching. He went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and proclaiming the good news of the kingdom, and He sent forth His apostles to do the same. That word "kingdom" was the one that, throughout His ministry, was most continually on His lips. He said more about it than He did about His word, His doctrine, His gospel, His truth—a great deal more than He did about His Church, of which He is only recorded to have spoken twice, and whose name occurs in only one out of the four Gospels.

In His parables, His discourses, His prophecies, are continually recurring these two phrases—kingdom of God, kingdom of Heaven. These two phrases are, I doubt not, Matthew, or Mark, or Luke's translations of one original Syriac phrase; for, in accounts of the same discourse as related by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, where Matthew writes usually "kingdom of the heavens," the other two write always "kingdom of God." Which is the exactest translation of our Lord's actual words, no one can ever tell; but it is clear that, in the mind of the original speaker, there must have been a sort of echo of a verse of the prophet Daniel, where it is said, "that the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, but shall consume all other kingdoms, and shall stand for ever." (Daniel ii. 44.)

Throughout His ministry He was preaching this kingdom. Everything else of which He spoke seemed to belong to the kingdom, and to be subordinate to it. His word was the word of the kingdom, His gospel the gospel of the kingdom, His mysteries the mysteries of the kingdom. His disciples were sent out to preach the kingdom; and they were permitted to hope that, as the reward of their labours, they should sit on thrones beside the king, and eat bread and drink new wine at the royal table. At last, He died the martyr of this one idea; His persistent preaching of it cost Him His life. It was the one capital charge in His indictment, and the subject of the label fixed over His head upon the cross. As a prophet, preacher, teacher, philosopher, He would have been perfectly safe. There was, in those days, the widest toleration of all mere opinions. It was only as a pretender to royalty that He fell under the hand of the temporal authorities. And His royal title He never would disclaim. Pilate's chief question to Him was "Art thou a king?" and His answer was persistently affirmative—"Thou sayest"—meaning "Thou sayest truly that I am a king." All the actors in the crucifixion felt that it was in this character that He was dying. The chief priests and scribes shouted, "Let Christ, the King of Israel, descend now from the cross." The soldiers put on Him a royal robe of scarlet, and a crown of thorns on His head, and a reed for a sceptre in His right hand. The robber at His side, His last convert, said, "Lord, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom." It is impossible to exaggerate, and difficult to represent sufficiently, the prevalence of this one idea throughout the whole history of Jesus, the anointed King of Israel.

Let us study to-day this expression and its meaning. And may the result of our thoughts be a truer loyalty, a more complete submission of our hearts and dedication of our lives to Christ our King.

In ancient times, the great desire and prayer of every nation was, that God would be pleased to send it a good king. In our time of progress, we are supposed to have reached the happy condition of self-government, in which nations have still their kings or presidents, whom they feed and clothe, and decorate, but whom they have deprived of all real power.

And yet things may work round again. At some future time, the nations, wearied out with the inconceivable baseness of demagogy, may raise to God from many a land of anarchy, the prayer, "Give us a king to reign over us—a man of strong heart and steadfast will, to deliver us from our enemies, and chiefly from those enemies whom we have at last discovered to be the worst we have—ourselves—our own passions—our own self-interest—our own self-will. Give us a man like Jesus Christ, who will work, not for Himself, but for us, who will do us good whether we like it or not, who will tell us truth whether we applaud Him or crucify Him, and thus deliver us from those who only flatter us that they may rule us." It is sad to think how often, when in past time that cry has been raised, those who uttered it have been led to throw themselves at the feet, not of the Christ, but of the Antichrist, the most selfish and falsest of mankind.

In the earliest days of the people of Israel, the

Lord Jehovah himself was their only king. We read of visible tokens of His presence, pillars of fire, pillars of cloud, glories shadowing the mercy-seat, which was the representation of His throne. From time to time, He sent a prophet to lead His people, and to reveal His will. But the demand of the people, even in those days, was, give us a king that he may go before us. Kings were given in answer to this request. They were never all that was desired, sometimes the very opposite of the people's wish; and so the desire went on growing "Send us a king who shall rule in righteousness, and shall sit upon the holy hill of Zion, as a true deliverer of God's people." When the people were carried into captivity to Babylon, and the earthly kingship failed altogether, the desire waxed stronger still. And to gratify that desire, and encourage that expectation, the prophet Daniel was taught to hold out the hope that the God of heaven would at last set up a kingdom that should never be destroyed, nor left to other people, but should break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms, and itself stand for ever.

This feeling went on increasing during the whole of the depressed period of the nation. King Herod on his throne feared that a true born son of David would be born to supersede him. The Pharisees asked when the kingdom of God should come. The ignorant Jewish multitude, and even the little children, were so full of the thought, that they were ready to burst out into the cry, "Hosanna to the Son of David: Blessed is the king that cometh in the name of Jehovah." The disciples asked, as the last question which they put to their Master, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom unto Israel."

The same thought prevailed throughout the apostles' age. They preached the gospel of the kingdom, were fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God. And they and we shall ever go on praying until the consummation of all things that prayer, which our Lord seems to have put into our mouths, that we might never lose this idea, and this expectation, "Thy kingdom come."

This slight sketch may suffice to show how full the Scripture is of this idea of Christ our King, and of His kingdom, and how deeply settled the idea is in the vitals of Christianity. If we Christians are anything, we are inhabitants of a kingdom, and subjects of a king.

As we look over the vast number of passages in which this word occurs, we find that they range themselves in three divisions, and speak of three different kingdoms, of all of which the crown belongs to Jesus Christ.

1. First in greatness, though last in order of time—at least for the human beings who are to inherit it—comes the future kingdom of glory and of happiness, which is the last hope of all mankind.

2. Second comes the outward visible kingdom, which partly in name and partly in deed acknowledges Jesus Christ's royalty—the earthly Church.

3. The third is the inward invisible kingdom, consisting of those true subjects of His, known certainly to Himself alone, over whose hearts He reigns, who love Him, serve Him, and obey Him.

In considering these three, I intend to transgress the common rhetorical rule, which advises a speaker to keep his strongest point for the last; and to speak first of the glorious vision of the future. For this vision contains in itself, and communicates to the others, all the power and virtue of the other two. The outward visible Church would be as dead a thing as those societies that were once formed on the symbolic worship of the ancient Egyptians, or the philosophy of the Druids; and the inward spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ on earth would have ceased to exist altogether; if the light of the eternal kingdom were not shed backward on these temporal ones.

We have, we trust, a Jerusalem here on earth—a visible organised Church, which we love, and in which we take pleasure — one whose humblest office is a prize and honour, in which it is better to be a door-keeper than the most respected dweller in the tents of ungodliness; one, out of which we must always be sweeping the evils which defile the sanctuary—falsehood, selfishness, worldly traffic, mean ambition, irreverence, ungodliness—one that we must ever be filling with all that is holy and noble, truth, self-denial, reverence, devotion, joyful praises, fervent prayers. But what model should we have, on which to build earthly Jerusalem, had not a view been given us of the heavenly Jerusalem, where all is holiness and beauty, and into which nothing enters that defileth, or that loveth and maketh a lie.

And God-in-Christ has an invisible kingdom here below, consisting of His people whom He knows, and who are to the bottom of their hearts His own. But all the hidden life of these, on which depends their obedience and loyalty to Christ their King, is hid with Him in the eternal kingdom in the better world.

Let us then take the highest thing first.

We pray for it every day unthinkingly, "Thy kingdom come." And though we speak the words mostly at random, yet in doing so we express one of the highest and deepest wants of man. From how many forgotten centuries, and distant lands, in how many varying languages, has the prayer gone up—"O God of righteousness, reign: take to thyself the power, put an end to the unrighteousness, and contention, and cruelty of man; and set up thine own kingdom of righteousness and peace and love!"

Our Lord undertook to satisfy this craving. He left His disciple, St. John, to draw the most perfect picture of it, under the name of the heavenly Jerusalem. We need not repeat the beautiful

words, but will only say that they contain everything which can satisfy the highest wishes of the noblest soul—light, truth, peace, holiness—all proceeding from Christ, who is the light, the truth, our peace, the Holy One. There are to be combined at last the palm branch of victory and the olive branch of peace. But though our Lord left that vision to be written by his favoured disciple, on whom fell for the last time the prophetic mantle, he had already traced the chief features of it with his own hand. The Son of Man was to sit as a king on the throne of His glory, with all the holy angels round him. He was to bid the blessed of his Father to come and inherit the kingdom. He said to His faithful followers, "I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me!" "The righteous were then to shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." In that kingdom they were to be equal to the angels, being the children of the resurrection. They were to see Abraham and all the prophets there.

But this heavenly kingdom has an ante-chamber here on earth, which is the visible Church. It is this which is like the leaven destined to spread in the great lump of the world, until the whole is leavened. This is the grain of mustard seed which is to increase and grow till it becomes the greatest of plants, in which the birds of the air may roost and build their nests. And this earthly kingdom has a feature which its heavenly model has not: it is liable to take in the evil as well as the good. For this earthly church is the net cast into the sea, which took in both the bad and the good. And this is a field in which the enemy finds it but too easy to sow his tares. At all its worship and all its feasts, there are some present who have not on the wedding garment. It is a weedy garden, but still a garden of the Lord. It has in it many disloyal subjects, and even aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, but it is still a kingdom of the king of heaven. Its besetting sins have ever been to rely on money and on worldly power, but it has in it that which power cannot work, and money cannot buy.

But there is yet another kingdom of heaven, of God, of Christ, greater, deeper, holier than any outward organisation can be. It is that kingdom of which the Master said, "It cometh not with observation, neither shall men say, Lo here, or Lo there, because it is within you." The eternal kingdom of God will come with observation when it does come. Every eye in heaven and earth will then be watching; every knee will then be bowing to the great visible Majesty. The earthly kingdom of Christ's Church comes with observation also. However unostentatious its ways, however humble its buildings, however simple its ritual, still the places may be pointed out where it meets, the congregations that come together, the words that it speaks, the acts of worship that it performs.

But there is a kingdom of God on earth, which we cannot see. The most far-seeing and penetrating minds often fail to detect its true subjects. It was a prophet of the Lord who said once of Jesse's first-born, surely the Lord's Anointed is before him, while the real chosen one was all the while out of sight at the sheep-folds. "For man judgeth by the outward appearance, but the Lord trieth the hearts." This inward kingdom includes all the faithful subjects, all the true-hearted. The Lord Jesus Himself described its nature to Pilate, when He told him that the subjects of His kingdom were only those who were "of the truth." The hidden kingdom of Christ consists of those who believe, and love, and obey.

It is for the members of this hidden kingdom alone that both the other two kingdoms exist. The visible Church of Christ is nothing but an embodiment of human pride and vain glory, unless it aims only at establishing the inward kingdom of Christ in the hearts of men. The kingdom in the world unseen admits no emigrants to pass its frontier, except such as have been citizens of the heavenly kingdom here.

Now there is a great evil, which occurs more or less in all times, of confusing the outward visible kingdom with the inward, and ascribing to the members of the former blessings and virtues which belong to the latter alone. There are endless contemporary examples of this confusion. But I prefer to quote an example of it from times very far away. When Constantine, the great Roman Emperor, became a Christian, the Church (*i.e.*, the outward visible one) passed at once from a state of persecution into a state of Court favour. Worldly power, which had till then been against it, passed over to its side. Constantine shortly afterwards called together the prelates, 318 in number, to the famous Council of Nicea. And when they were assembled, he treated them with great civility, and one day he asked them to dinner—the whole 318 of them. It was a very splendid entertainment. And some of the bishops, as they came away, said to one another that surely now the kingdom of God was come.

And yet perhaps there cannot be a more doubtful historical question than whether the passing over of worldly power to the side of Christ's Church did more to advance Christ's inward kingdom, or to damage and corrupt it. From that day there flocked in millions of outward converts into the visible Church. That Church laid hold of education, and the nations of which the Roman world was then composed became Christians in name. But they brought in with them their vices, and very soon their idolatries. Some of the Puritan mediæval sects used to say that the Church had been apostate ever since the days of St. Silvester, who was the contemporary Roman bishop. At least it became true, that thenceforth the inward spiritual Church of Christ was only a little flock hid amongst the vast multitudes which formed the

outward visible body, and professed the Saviour's name.

Let us, for our own parts, hold fast this one vital fundamental truth. The outward visible Church of Christ exists only for the sake of building up the inward spiritual one. We come together for prayer; the Word is preached to us; the Lord's table is spread for us, in order, first, to convert, and then to edify or build up in faith and love subjects of Christ's inward kingdom. The kingdom that cometh not with observation—the kingdom which men cannot point out with the finger, saying, Lo here, or Lo there—the kingdom that is within—the kingdom which is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost—the kingdom that is founded in men's hearts by God's Holy Spirit—this is the kingdom of which on earth Christ is truly King. This is the one whose foundation by our Lord was such good news to mankind. This is the one which He Himself went preaching. This is the one for which He bids us labour, and it is for this that we must be chiefly praying when we say, "Thy kingdom come."

And it is this which ought to be the chief object of all those religious societies, of one of which I am the advocate to-day. The Church Pastoral Aid Society certainly professes to direct its chief efforts to the establishment of Christ's kingdom of righteousness in men's hearts. It preaches the kingdom of God. It puts the living word first, and lets organisation and ceremonial follow afterwards. That is at least its theory. And I trust and believe that in its practice it does its best to carry out that theory. It would be itself the readiest to confess how very far performance lags behind ideal. Like all other genuine efforts to do good, it feels itself, in presence of the evil in the world which has to be conquered, and the good that has to be done, like a great Apostle, in weakness and in fear, and in much trembling. It would bid its represensatives to exclude all boasting from their addresses, and would only venture to say humbly, that it is an honest effort to promote that kingdom, which is righteousness and peace and joy—all in the Holy Ghost—all effectuated through the power of goodness, of Christ, and of Christ's spirit. As such it pleads for your support.

Many here and elsewhere may think, as in times gone by, that the Lord is slack concerning his promise, and that the kingdom of righteousness and peace is very long in coming. True! But the old answer still holds good. One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. Perhaps that old answer is more striking now, when modern science has so vastly enlarged all our conceptions, both of time and of eternity. If the purposes of God in nature require ages of ages in being realised, shall we feel surprised that, less than 2,000 years after Christ, we see not yet all things put under the King of Righteousness and Prince of Peace. It is disappointing, no doubt, that a man in a life-time can succeed in effecting so very little, and such imperfect good. But take courage; fear not. Each single action, however small, if it be but good and true, each single gift, is a stone prepared for the hand of the Great Architect; and He will find a place for it in that great building which He is erecting—that kingdom of God, wherein regenerated mankind, and perhaps the inhabitants of other worlds besides, may find righteousness and peace and happiness.

THE WISE CHOICE.

By the Rev. JOHN J. COLEMAN, M.A., Curate of Dulverton, Somerset.

Sermon Preached in Dulverton Parish Church, on the Third Sunday after the Epiphany, 1889.

"And if it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom ye will serve."—Joshua xxiv. 15.

THESE words were spoken by the great successor of Moses, who was both in name and office a type of the Saviour of the Church of God—Joshua, in the language of the Old Testament, being equivalent to Jesus in that of the New Testament.

Joshua was about to be gathered unto his fathers. He assembled the Israelites. He reminded them of God's gracious dealings with their forefathers and with themselves. The place of assembly was Shechem, where Abraham built his first altar to the Lord, after he had obeyed God's call and had left Haran. It was the place where Jacob bought a parcel of land and built an altar, calling it by the name of "God—the God of Israel," after he had left Padan-Aram, where also he commanded his household and followers to put away the strange gods, to be clean, and to change their garments, before they went up according to God's command to build an altar at Beth-El. It was there that the bones of the sons of Jacob had been buried. There too Joshua had assembled the Israelites after the taking of Jericho and Ai, and had built an altar, and had written upon stones the Law of God, and then had read the words of the Law, the blessings and the cursings, to the people, some of them standing upon Mount Gerizim and others upon Mount Ebal. At Shechem the Divine Joshua, our Blessed Lord Himself, taught the woman of Samaria, and prophesied of the extension of the worship of the true God throughout the world, and spake of the Living Water—the Holy Spirit—which was to be given to those who should thirst for it.

The place of these several sacred associations was chosen by Joshua, where he would rehearse

in the ears of the people the mighty and merciful acts of the Lord, and where he would endeavour to join them to the Lord in an enduring covenant.

He reminds them that the Lord had chosen Abraham, had kept His covenant with him and with Isaac and Jacob, had delivered the sons of Jacob out of their cruel bondage in Egypt, had both led them and delivered them in the wilderness, had brought them into the land of Canaan, had subdued their enemies before them—the seven iniquitous nations which occupied the country promised by God to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and their seed for ever—and had given them cities built, and vineyards and oliveyards planted, ready for their possession and enjoyment. "Now, therefore," he says to Israel, "fear the LORD and serve Him in sincerity and in truth, and put away the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the flood and in Egypt, and serve ye the LORD. And if it seem evil unto you to serve the LORD, choose you this day whom you will serve."

The proposition is put before people who had already had experience in the "goodness and severity of God"—in His goodness towards them when they followed and obeyed Him—in His severity when they murmured in unbelief and rebelled against the service of the One God.

This people had the benefit of the experience of their forefathers as well as of their own. They knew the Lord to be a God who had never broken His promise, who was full of grace and goodness towards His people when they trusted Him, who, however, would by no means clear the guilty, but would punish rebellion and idolatry.

If, with all this knowledge of Jehovah, they are still without the faith to trust Him wholly and solely as their God, their Helper, and their Deliverer, Joshua requires them to make choice of a god whom they would serve.

It is worthy of observation, that Joshua does not ask the Israelites whether or not they will serve any god. It is taken as a matter of course, and assumed as a fact that they must serve some acknowledged superior, because it is a part of man's nature to fear and to serve a Superior Being, or a Superior Power. It is only "the fool" who "hath said in his heart there is no God"—one who has utterly rebelled against the better side of human nature, and has crushed out the natural feelings of fear, awe, and reverence.

Now this is the statement of an important truth. If men will not serve the Lord, they will nevertheless be the slaves of something—of Satan—of sin—of their own lusts—or of the riches, pleasures, or cares of this world. It has been well said: "We have not the liberty to choose whether we will serve or no; all the liberty we have is to choose our master."

Many a one has been led astray from the service of God by the seductive wiles of a promised liberty from all restraint. The authority of parents has been disregarded, and the warnings of God's Word have been forgotten or despised. The yoke of Christ's service has been cast off, but there was taken in exchange the chain of the destroyer of the souls of men. The authority of the father was rejected, and the entreaties of the mother were perhaps mocked; but, instead of freedom from constraint, the enslaving influence of some evil companion became an exacting tyranny, from which there was no escape. The engagements, vows, and responsibility of a baptized body and soul were forgotten or trampled upon, and submission to the cravings of ungoverned lusts, and to the maxims and practices of the world of evil, brought, instead of freedom, the most abject slavery. "If it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom ye will serve."

Exclusive service of the Lord is here taught us. We cannot serve the Lord *and* something, or some one, besides. Joshua warns Israel that the Lord is a jealous God, that He will not share our devotion with another. Our Lord Jesus Christ's teaching is the same as this, declaring the failure that must attend any attempt to serve God and Mammon. Moreover, the religion of the Gospel, with its greater light, higher privileges, miracles, and supernatural gifts, and with its Cross to be believed in and to be borne, is not less exacting of the devotion of men than were the requirements of the Law given by Moses. Jesus, our Divine Master and Lawgiver, tells us that to love earthly relatives more than Him, or to shrink from the bearing of that sorrow and affliction that must come, in one shape or another, upon every one who seriously takes in hand the great business of saving the soul, and so to renounce the necessary inheritance of that legacy of suffering which the Lord Jesus left to His faithful disciples, as a mark of belonging to Him—that to indulge such love, or to refuse such affliction and suffering, is to make it impossible to be, at the same time, Christ's disciple.

This warning against supposing it to be possible to serve the Lord partly, and some other god partly, is a healthy one for us all; living as we do under the present dispensation of the Church of God, and in an age that boasts itself of superior knowledge and intelligence. There is still a danger of idolatry. Conscience will be heard when it has not been utterly seared: and conscience will make men fear the Lord. Yet there are, on the other hand, "gods many and lords many" which draw away our hearts, if we are not careful. There are many idols before which men and women bow down, though they are not always of stone or metal, graven into the imaginary representation of a supposed god. One man will make an idol of his calling in the world. Another will idolize some pleasure. One will place reason and intellect upon the throne of God. Another will worship some master-passion—even some degrading

lust—with as much reality of service as ever the men of heathen times served false gods, and practised even uncleanness, or drunkenness, in their honour.

And the idolatry of which we are speaking is the idolatry of a so-called Christian. It is an attempt to divide the heart, and mind, and body, giving them up sometimes to a hypocritical service of the Lord, and at other times to the slavery of the favourite idol that may have possession of the heart. Moreover, the idols which we place in the heart are not, in every case, enormities, monsters, sinful lusts,—things in themselves evil. Sometimes we may idolise that which is allowable—even praiseworthy—if kept in its right place, and not permitted to divide our heart with God and His service. What is the worldly calling of each of us but something that is necessary, and both right and praiseworthy if lawfully followed? Yet it may be turned into an idol to which we may sacrifice our health, our time, and our powers of mind and body, only to find out in the end that life has been one long attempt to serve the Lord, and, at the same time, some rival god, and to reap as a consequence the hideous fear of the loss of the inheritance of the land of glory.

The proposition made by the words of our text was not presented to people who had not heretofore professed to serve the Lord, and who had not before time had abundant experience of the dealings of the Lord, and of His mercy, jealousy, power, and faithfulness. They had inherited the experience of their forefathers, stretching back for five hundred years. Besides that, they had their own personal experience in the ways of the Lord. They had seen the river Jordan divided by a miracle. Seven nations had been cast out to make room for them, in order that they might possess the fulfilment of the promise made unto their fathers.

We may expect that God will, in like manner, still deal with churches and with nations; that He will give them, from time to time, opportunities of greater blessing, and also trials, to prove them whether they will walk in His laws or not.

Our own Church is passing through much trial. Great opportunities are offered to her for spreading the fame of Christ, and for advancing His kingdom. On the other hand, there is the temptation to tamper with the "one faith," and to lower the standard of morals, exhibited in the written Word of God, and taught by the Word of God incarnate, in order to quiet opposition, to suit the license of the age, and to pander to its impatience of all authority excepting that of the opinion of the world, and that of its maxims and decrees. Already the law of our nation, in the matter of divorce, is in direct contravention of the law of God, as stated by our Lord Jesus Christ. Repeated efforts, we know, are being made to alter the marriage law in such a particular as will result in the further violation of the law of God, and in the breaking down of one more of the barriers fixed by that law to guard the sanctity of the "great mystery" of marriage.

Not long since murmurs arose denoting an impatience against the national acknowledgment of God, in the profession of Christianity as the religion of the nation. What if these murmurs rise at length into a demand that will madly hurry this country into a national act of rejection of the worship of God, and of the awful sin of sacrilege, by robbing God of His appointed portion! Surely it is true of nations as well as of individuals: "them that honour Me I will honour, and they that despise Me shall be lightly esteemed." In these trials under which our Church and country seem now to be placed, do we not see a proposition made to us as Churchmen and Englishmen: "If it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom ye will serve?"

Both Church and country have a long history of goodness and gracious dealing at the hands of God. Let us then determine, by God's grace, that, so far as it lies in our power, we will by our influence and by our efforts make answer as a Church and as a nation, "God forbid that we should forsake the Lord."

But we turn from Church and nation to ourselves singly. We must stand alone, for "each one of us must give account of himself to God." Though we may have professed to serve the Lord from our earliest days; though many of us may have rendered a real but imperfect service for some years; yet there may have been times and occasions, and such times and occasions may recur, when we were put upon our trial and required to acknowledge the Lord anew as our God, to re-consecrate ourselves to His service, and to renew our vows of faith and obedience.

The invitation to prepare for "Confirmation" is an invitation to make the choice to which the text has reference. Those who present themselves to be confirmed are required to make their declaration of having made this choice, *before* they receive "Confirmation;" because otherwise they would not possess the state of heart capable of receiving the blessing conveyed thereby. For in what does "Confirmation" consist? The essence of "Confirmation" is prayer, offered by a Bishop, asking that the Gift of the Holy Ghost may be granted to persons who have been baptized, accompanied with the laying of his hand upon the head of each one to be confirmed, as the outward sign of "the coming of the Holy Ghost" to dwell in him, and to make his heart the throne of God in a way in which it has never been so before, and to make his body the Temple—the Dwelling-place—of God.

There is a mistake sometimes perhaps made, concerning the purpose of Confirmation, which leads persons to suppose, and to hope, that, if

they come to be confirmed, they will experience some change of heart, and will then turn to the Lord. But this is not the teaching of the Bible, or of the Church, as to the purpose of this sacred rite. Confirmation has been called—and well called—the Sacrament of Conversion. The teaching of the Bible and that of our own Prayer Book show that Confirmation is an ordinance for the bestowal of the gift of the Holy Ghost upon those who have been baptized, and who are in a converted state, and who, consequently, are in a state of salvation. If you will look at the Confirmation Service, you will see that before the Bishop prays for, and lays his hands upon, the candidates, he asks a very solemn question, the answer to which is a profession of having turned from sin, of faith in God, and of intention to lead a life of obedience to the Will of God? Now, what is such a profession but one of being in a converted state of heart? From what has been said, you will see that Confirmation is designed to be a means of spiritual strength to those who are baptized and converted to God, and that what constitutes it a means of spiritual strength is the great—the unspeakable—Gift of the Holy Ghost.

Hence you will better understand why we, the clergy, are so particular as to our preparation of candidates for Confirmation why we take pains to impress upon them the solemnity of that holy, awful Service, and why we enforce upon them the need of careful preparation, lest they profane it, and so provoke God's wrath against them, and bring down punishment instead of blessing. And I would take this opportunity of asking the faithful of this church and place to pray for all who shall be confirmed: that they may come with hearts truly converted to God.

Lastly, the invitation to make the choice stated in our text may come in the preaching of God's Word. It may come to some here to-night—to some who are growing weary in well-doing—to some who have been forgetful of their God—to some who have been careful and troubled about many things of this life: lifted up by its successes and brightness, or depressed and discouraged by failure and misfortune—to some who have been wandering from their Saviour, and have forgotten that they are redeemed, and that they have been baptized—to some who have tasted deeply of the bitterness of sin, and of the foul dregs of unhallowed pleasures. "Choose you this day"—this night. Brethren, let us seek for the grace that will enable us to make that happy choice:—"Jehovah our God will we serve, and His Voice will we obey."

THE *Record* understands that Sir T. Fowell Buxton, as the representative of certain friends of the Church Missionary Society who desire to remain anonymous, has repaid to the British Imperial East African Company the sum of £1,200 for the slaves recently enfranchised at Church Missionary Society stations.

PAMPHLET and Advice FREE

Every man and woman in search of HEALTH should write without delay to Mr. C. B. HARNESS, *Consulting Medical Electrician* (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his *New Medical Work*, entitled "Harness' Guide to Health," which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of Harness' Electropathic Belt and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper.

MR. C. B. HARNESS also gives Advice Free of charge (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1889.

ITALY'S INCREASING BURDENS.

NOTWITHSTANDING the heavy and painful burdens which enormous naval and military armaments have, of late years, imposed upon the Italian nation, its rulers appear to be strangely unimpressed by the miseries and mischiefs which this unwise course is creating amongst that interesting people. But they are being rudely awakened to one unpleasant experience, which is the necessary result of hasty action on the part of any Government, in the direction of compliance with the demands either of ambition or of panic.

About twelve years ago the Italian Government surprised Europe by launching out into the most extravagant expenditure upon their navy. Vast ships of war were constructed, one of which, the "Duilio," attained the size of eleven thousand tons. These vessels were armed with guns of one hundred tons each and, further, were partially covered with armour-plates. They were built on such a scale, and so heavily weighted, that it was feared complete armour would cause them to sink peacefully to the bottom of the ocean before they would be of the slightest help in active hostilities.

A competent native authority has just written an article in the Naples *Courier*, in which he shows that this new fleet, which was a source of such pride to its originators at the time, has already become antiquated and comparatively valueless, owing to the advances in naval construction subsequently made by other nations. Had the Italians maintained cool heads upon their shoulders, and kept their money in their pockets, instead of squandering untold millions upon these

huge vessels, they would be now in an incomparably stronger position, even from a naval point of view. For they would be able to avail themselves of the latest improvements in construction instead of being limited to the humiliating process of patching up their almost obsolete ships.

The efficiency of the latter has vanished, but the debt and the outlay remain, either actually or in their results of failure.

This Italian experience, however, is so specially instructive, that it should be widely pondered by Englishmen and impressed upon their rulers; for, too often, modern British ships of war are speedily found to be utter failures. Thus the "Hood," of 91 guns, constructed in 1849, the "Encounter," 1,970 tons, built in 1873, and a whole category of others, have already had to be sold or broken up, at a great loss to the taxpayers, though probably at great gain to many dockyard officials and Government contractors.

Italy being a poorer nation than England is more severely pinched by such humiliating failures. Her consequently heavy taxation presses terribly upon the agricultural and indigent classes. So profound is the misery amongst millions of these, that they are becoming desperate and disloyal. Thus, at a meeting held last month, in Milan, the cry of "Long live Anarchy" was welcomed by a large audience.

A recent author and traveller, Dr. W. N. Beauclerk, states in his new work, entitled "Rural Italy" (London: Bentley), that the peasantry "are always in debt," although their food is so poor that it really consists of coarse bread (made of barley or maize), a few beans, chestnuts, and vegetables. In winter the families and their cattle are huddled together for warmth, fuel being comparatively dear. The moral condition of the peasantry, and even of their priests, is fearful. As to the Italians of Sicily, Dr. Beauclerk observes: "They are sunk in antediluvian ignorance. Their prevalent crimes are too shocking to be described; incest and rape are the least horrible of their ordinary crimes. The very priests keep concubines without shame or concealment; children are sold for prostitution by their own parents; pandering, incest and uxorcide, have reached astounding proportions; and all this in the midst of vast superstition, superficial religious faith, and abject saint-worship in every hovel and brothel."

The mortgages on Italian land amount to eight hundred million pounds, or more than the vast National Debt of Great Britain. The total estimated value of the property on which these mortgages are effected only exceeds that amount by 160 million pounds, so that the country is mortgaged "up to the hilt," whilst the rate of interest on the debt is about 8 per cent.! Hence it is no wonder that misery, vice, and murder abound in Italy. But the chief cause of all this woe is the madness of yielding to naval and military ambition and panic-mongering folly.

And the end is not yet. The Italian Government is still incurring further outlay upon iron-clads and armies, and swelling, as the frog in the fable, in emulation of the bullock-like proportions of the armaments of gigantic Russia and Germany. Meanwhile, too, Italy has been threatening and irritating her French neighbours to a dangerous extent, whilst entering into an offensive and defensive alliance with Austria and Germany. Alas! for any nation whose rulers are so blind to its true safety and best interests.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Collect for Sexagesima Sunday.

The prayer which our Church provides for this week's special use is one of a very direct and searching character. It is a prayer which admits of no evasion. It is one in which we make a certain, definite statement respecting our moral condition. In using it, we must either come to God, the All-seeing One, with, as it were, a lie in our right hand; or we must have learnt to know ourselves, to appreciate our own weakness; we must have recognised that in ourselves we have "no power to help ourselves." This grace of humility is almost as rare as it is beautiful and god-like: it is a virtue to which we would all fain lay claim; we none of us like to feel that our neighbour thinks we have too high an estimate of our own good qualities. Yet, in spite of all this, how few of us are really humble! How difficult we find it to "esteem others better than ourselves!" But if in presence of our fellow mortals we are inclined to think ourselves equal with them, surely this difficulty vanishes when we are face to face with the Almighty God. When we view ourselves in the dazzling light of His Perfect Purity and Eternal Righteousness. And yet—is it so? Do we always find it easy to place ourselves side by side with the publican, and to cry only "God be *merciful* to me a sinner"? Let us confess the truth, let us learn this lesson of the approaching season of Lent; oh! let us away with all blinds, so that we may see things as *they are*, and then, free from all thoughts of our own worthiness, released from that most insidious enemy, the vanity of humility, we shall take this prayer earnestly and truly to God, and say, from our hearts, "O Lord God, who *seest* that we put not our trust in anything that we do." *Then* may we proceed with the rest of the Collect; God will hear and defend us in His way from all adversity. We must remember here that—

> "Ill that God blesses is our good;
> And unblest good is ill,
> And all is right that seems most wrong,
> If it be His sweet will.

and so not chafe when God sends us trials and disappointments. We are so shortsighted here, our means of knowledge are so scanty, that we cannot judge rightly. When we get "beyond the veil," we shall see all things clearly, and we shall *know* what now we can only perhaps *believe*,—"That all things work together for good to them that love God." We shall understand that truly he has defended us from *all* adversity.

THE LOWER HOUSE OF CONVOCATION.

THE agenda for the House of Laymen, which meets on Tuesday next, contains the following business :—The vice-chairman (Mr. G. A. Spottiswoode) will call attention to messages from the Archbishop on the urgent need of the reform of Convocation ; and on the present state of the law as to the solemnisation of marriage in mother churches, district churches, &c., with reference to existing Acts and to recent discussions upon those Acts, and will move that the former subject be taken into consideration on Thursday, and that the latter be referred to a committee. The vice-chairman will next call attention to "the report of the Lower House in the form of a Bill on Church Trusts," and move that it be referred to a committee. He will also, by request of the Archbishop, bring before the House the importance of considering, "What is the duty of a Church as a Church in respect of slavery?" His Grace has also requested that the report of the committee of the Lambeth Conference on purity should be discussed, and that questions numbered 1-8 may receive some answers or suggestions. The following resolutions will be submitted :—

Mr. Spottiswoode (London) :—I. "That this House approves generally of the draft Enabling Bill appended to the Report on the Increase of the Episcopate." "II. That the Archbishop be requested, should the draft Bill meet with his Grace's approval, to take steps to procure its passing into law."

Mr. De Winton (St. Davids) :—"That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that any new diocese which shall have been sanctioned should be formed and a bishop thereto appointed as soon as an endowment of £2,000 a year and a house has been provided, though the endowment of such new see be not considered to be completed until it has been made up to the minimum proposed by the committee in their 1888 report."

Professor Stokes, M.P. (Ely) :—I. "That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that power should be given to authorise the provision of additional services for use in the Church of England, and for the revision from time to time of the rubrics and directions contained in the Book of Common Prayer, in some such manner as is provided by the draft Bill." II. "That this House approves of the principle of the third clause of the draft Bill, but considers that an interval of months should elapse between the publication of any scheme and its ratification by her Majesty in Council."

Sir Douglas Fox (Rochester) :—"That with reference to the draft 'Prayer Book (Rubrics and Additional Services) Bill,' it is, in the opinion of this House, of great importance that provision should be made for increased elasticity in the services of the Church, so as to avoid undue repetition, and to enable the services to be adapted to the special circumstances of each congregation."

Mr. C. J. Blagg (Lichfield) :—"To call attention to the law of dilapidations, with special reference to a Bill about to be introduced into the House of Commons for the amendment of such law, and to move a resolution thereon."

On Wednesday, February 27 :—

Colonel White-Thomson (Exeter) : — "That this House, viewing the report of the Royal Education Commission in its bearing upon the religious and moral training of the children of the nation at large, approves in particular of the following conclusions set forth therein :—

"1. With respect to Public Elementary Schools—

"(*a*) That it is of the highest importance that all children should receive religious and moral training ;

"(*b*) That it is of equal importance that the teachers who are charged with the moral training of the scholars should continue to take part in the religious instruction ;

"(*c*) That all registers should be marked before the religious teaching and observances begin ;

"(*d*) That any reasonable precaution which might tend to remove any suspicion of unfairness in the administration of the Conscience Clause should be adopted ;

"(*e*) That children should not obtain total exemption from day-school attendance until they are thirteen years of age ;

"(*f*) That the age for half-time exemption should be fixed at eleven years ;

"(*g*) That continuation schools should be made an integral part of the elementary system of education, and that these schools should be adapted to the needs of working boys and girls, so as to attract and interest tired children, and prepare them for the actual duties of life.

"2. With respect to the Parliamentary grant—

"(*a*) That the terms on which it is awarded should be embodied in an Act of Parliament, and not left dependent on a minute of the Privy Council ;

"(*b*) That its distribution should be such as to minimise the drawbacks of payment by results ;

"(*c*) That the 17s. 6d. limit should be abolished.

"3. With respect to income, &c.—

"(*a*) That public elementary schools for which no rent is paid or received should be exempt from local rates ;

"(*b*) That guardians of the poor should pay the fees of indigent children attending voluntary schools direct to the managers.

"4. Training Colleges—

"That the experiment of day training colleges might be tried on a limited scale in large centres."

Mr. John Shelly (Exeter) :—"That this House, impressed with a deep sense of the value of the voluntary schools, in which religious teaching may be freely given to the children of the poor, with a perfect liberty of withdrawal, and perceiving the difficulty of maintaining such schools in the face of the increasing cost of elementary education, is of opinion that legislative provision should be made for their relief ; and at the same time this House urges upon Churchmen the duty of aiding the maintenance and improvement of their schools by liberal contributions."

AT a Court of Assistants of the Sons of the Clergy, held at the Corporation House, Bloomsbury-place, on Saturday, the 16th inst., Mr. Paget Bowman announced that two important contributions had recently been received to the Clergy Distress Fund—viz., £335 4s. 9d., the surplus of the recent Manchester Church Congress Fund, and £105 given by the well-known London bankers, Messrs. Williams, Deacon. Upon the motion of the Bishop of Hereford, seconded by Mr. John G. Talbot, M.P., a special vote of thanks for these valuable gifts was unanimously passed. Grants amounting to £745 were made from the fund, in addition to £700 from the ordinary funds of the Corporation.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE SERMON BIBLE." Vol. II. 1 Kings to Psalm LXXVI. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

WE strongly recommend the first volume of "The Sermon Bible" to our readers as not being one of those many modern publications which are only designed to save the people the trouble of thinking, but as a real help to a preacher who wants ideas which he can work out for himself. And it might be sufficient to say that the sermons in this second volume are as well condensed as those in the first seemed to be, and are chosen from as wide a range of preachers. But we want to make one suggestion: We cannot altogether approve the practice of preaching from the Prayer Book version of the Psalms, unless the preacher first assures himself that the better known version does not differ from the less known version for the worse. Where the two versions differ only in form it matters not which be chosen; but when men like Professor Huxley (whose articles respectable people do read) are re-braying objections to Christianity as old, and not more valuable than Tom Paine's (whose books respectable people do not read), it behoves preachers to be careful. And a sermon from a text that will not bear comparison with the Hebrew or Greek does give great occasion to the enemy to blaspheme. Therefore, in the third volume, let sermons which rely on mistranslations be rigorously excluded.

"A MANUAL FOR HOLY DAYS." By F. C. Woodhouse, M.A. London: Wells Gardiner, Darton & Co.

THIS is a thoughtful little book, containing many germs, which may be worked up for sermon, lecture, or instruction. The writer has succeeded in his avowed object of regarding "old facts and well-known characters, as far as possible, in the full light of modern knowledge, and with the open-eyed gaze of Nineteenth Century realism." His language is quiet but suggestive: he speaks as he thinks. The subjects chosen are attractive, and their treatment is not disappointing or hackneyed:—"Modern Unbelief"; "Is Christianity Impracticable and Unmanly?" "The Nineteenth Century Priest"; "What the Risen Bodies will be"; "Money"; "The Miseries of the World not from God," are specimens, and all will repay a careful perusal. The quotations are, for the most part, apt and telling, even in one instance from Faber, where it seems too strong. This contains the words: "Can God die? Yes; God is dead," which support the "hiddenness of God," and are of course intended to refer to the second Person of the Trinity, both by their author and the present writer, one of whose good points is that he treats secular and modern questions in a strictly orthodox, and yet quite in stereotyped fashion. But nowadays men deal with facts, not figures of speech; and it was the human, not the Divine Nature, that suffered death in the person of Christ. This expression, "God is dead," has led Unitarians to stumble, in the same way that another well-known phrase, "The Mother of God," has long been a rock of offence. In this case we may fairly say that the writer's own words are a better exponent of his subject than those he adduces in support of it. He has a happy mode of dealing with long established prejudices and abuses, as, for instance, at pp. 57-8, where we read:—

"Very often a man has his own personal reasons for his absence from church. You will, for instance, hear a man say that he was once turned out of a pew in an uncourteous manner, and that he has never been to church since, and does not intend to go again; as if he were doing a very manly action, which he is rather proud of."

We may also quote a pregnant passage on pp. 110-11 from "The Nineteenth Century Priest" as a good example of the style:—

"The age is greedy of teachers, athirst for knowledge; men are more than ever conscious of their needs; more than ever willing to be led and guided, if they can find anyone worthy of their confidence, able to give them what they want. And how great, how many, how imperious and urgent are those wants! Our old text-books are antiquated. We want new books on almost every Christian subject; evidence, criticism, Scripture, prophecy, history, antiquities, physics, metaphysics, casuistry. We want preachers, well-read, grave men, who can command the respect and attention of the noble and mighty intellects of the day; spiritual men, who can lift up those who are absorbed in material facts to supernatural and heavenly verities; eloquent men who can attract the shallow pleasure-loving herd; and pull them down by main force upon their knees before their Saviour's feet. We want preachers who will stand up Sunday after Sunday because they have something to say, not just because they have to say something."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE NEW SPANISH PRAYER BOOK.

SIR,—I see it stated in one of the English papers that this "Prayer-book is very similar to our own." Will you then allow me to show you that, on a vital point, the Grace of Baptism theory is in diametrical opposition between the Anglican Prayer-book and this new one?

2. The paths diverge at the meaning of the term Regeneration. The new book makes it Conversion. I don't say that is the best meaning to put on the word regeneration, I only insist on what it means in our services. One of the Irish bishops said in the Synod, "Regeneration does not mean conversion, but the first motions of grace, leading thereto." This only makes matters worse, if possible. If I were myself to define the meaning of regeneration, as used in our services, I would say, "all that infancy is capable of, and that a converted adult still requires."

3. There is a prayer in the Spanish service for infant baptism, p. 136, which gives a fair idea of the new theology. "God, who enriches His Church with great increase of believers, give His grace to the regenerate, and grant to them, whom He hath yet to regenerate, that they may attain," &c. Here it is evident that, by regeneration, is meant something future to the baptised infant. We have the same in the adult baptismal service, p. 147, "Give His grace to the regenerate, and grant to them, whom He hath yet to regenerate, that they may attain," &c.

4. As we all have heard so much of the Gorham decision, and the charitable hypothesis, it may be well now, in a few words, to dispose of both.

5. The Gorham decision was, that something called regeneration may take place before, at, or after baptism. What is meant by this regeneration is plain. It gave Seckan sermons, which addressed his readers as unregenerate, that is, unconverted. Whether conversion may abstractedly be called regeneration is a question. That the services do not use it in that sense is evident. When Seckan's regeneration may take place is of no consequence, the Prayer-book regeneration can take place only in baptism. It is God's act and not the man's, which conversion is. God then pardons and adopts. Conversion is a man's consentient submission to the motions of God's grace. This is impossible in the infant. In the adult, like St. Paul, it had taken place before. So we may leave the Gorham decision. It is nothing at all *ad rem.*

6. I come now to the charitable hypothesis. What does this mean? It is that the clergyman and the congregation charitably hope that what they assert to have taken place, has so taken place; and for this they thank God. Is this conversion? Have clergyman and congregation the face to say that they charitably hope that the baby has been then converted? As well believe that it can speak Hebrew, or fly about as an angel. They believe no such thing, though they assert it and thank God for it. What they charitably hope is that the infant will hereafter be converted. So they do not charitably hope that anything has taken place, though they go through the farce of asserting that it has, and thanking God for the fact.

7. Now we turn to adult baptism. In it there is equally a farce, for an event is asserted to have then taken place, and God is thanked for the fact. What do I mean by this farce? If regeneration, then the subject of assertion and thanksgiving, be conversion, the whole thing is a farce, because the man is brought up to the font as already converted. To assert that, in the rite, he has been converted, is as much as to say that he came up unconverted, and as a hypocrite; and it is monstrous to take it for granted that God, in the rite, converts every hypocrite, and equally monstrous to suppose that every adult so coming is a hypocrite, unconverted, yet pretending to be converted. The charitable hypothesis is equally untenable in either case, of infants or adults. So I take leave of it, and the Gorham decision also.

8. Now every page in these new baptismal services goes on the plan that regeneration is conversion; therefore they never assert the fact either of infant or adult, and it is a most daring assertion that "this Prayer-book is very similar to our own." On the article of the Creed, "One baptism for the remission of sins," there is a diametrical opposition; and when we disagree as to the Creed, there can be no similarity at all. It is bad to set up a new episcopate in an organised, though corrupt, Church; but that is a trifle compared with sending it a Prayer-book, which teaches heresy as to baptism.

9. There are equal errors as to the Ordinal, Absolution, the cross in Baptism, and kneeling at the Eucharist. In fact, the book is full of what is contrary to our Prayer-book—but I must stop. The book is to be had at Partridge's, London, and Hodges, Dublin.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

JONAH'S HISTORY.

SIR,—I read Canon Crosthwaite's letter in a previous number, and your correspondent "Presbyter's" in your last, and I must say I fail to see how the one is an answer to the other. No doubt the rabbis might teach in the way alluded to in the extract from the Speaker's Commentary, and the greater portion of our Lord's teaching was parabolical, as his hearers were able to bear it. But must it inevitably follow that His references to Jonah are to be regarded in the same light? What is there more wonderful in the history of Jonah's miraculous escape from drowning, than St. Paul's escape from the serpent which fastened on his hand? There is not a hint of our Saviour's casting a doubt on Jonah's history, or of his hearers taking what He said as parabolical or allegorical. The real question seems to be this, whether our Lord would speak a parable in the form of a history, mix it up with other undoubted histories, and run the risk of His prophecy of His lying in the tomb, and resurrection, and the subsequent history of those events, on which all our faith depend, being taken for myths or parables.

INQUIRENS.

MR. R. HUGHES PRITCHARD, secretary to the Bishop of Bangor, has forwarded to the Rev. J. Williams Meyrick, rector of Llandegfan with Beaumaris, the report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the method of administering the services at Llandegfan, which states that for at least three months there has been no divine service held on Sunday in that church, and proceeds:—"We therefore report that in our opinion the ecclesiastical duties of the said benefice are inadequately performed in the said parish church, but that, with reference to the chapelry of Beaumaris, three services are supplied on Sunday by the Rev. John Williams Meyrick. We also made inquiry into the net yearly value of the said benefice, and we find that the average value of the tithe rentcharge (which is commuted at £366 7s. 6d. for the four years 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, after deducting rates, taxes, and cost of collection), amounts to £254 per annum, of which Mr. Williams Meyrick received under sequestration £150 per annum." Mr. Pritchard, in forwarding the report, offers at the Bishop's request to effect an amicable arrangement of the matters in dispute. The sequestration will be relaxed on performance of works necessary to put the buildings in a proper state of repair; if that is not done the existing sequestration will have to be continued indefinitely.

MEDICAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND MUSICAL CONVERSAZIONE.—A Grand Conversazione was held on the 19th inst. at The Medical Battery Company's Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London. The entertainment was exceptionally interesting and instructive, the main object being to acquaint the leading members of the Medical Faculty and representatives of the Press with the Company's endless resources and perfect appliances and arrangements for the treatment and cure of disease. The chief methods which they employ for this purpose are applications of Continuous and Induced Statical and Electrical Currents, Massage Manipulations, Swedish Mechanical Exercises, Chemical Inhalation, &c. Shortly before nine o'clock Mr. Harness delivered a short address of welcome to the

guests present, and gave an interesting and descriptive account of the rapid growth of the Company, and its future intentions, and the remarkable manner in which the Electropathic and other Methods of Treatment had met with public favour and become so deservedly popular. He explained how, through lack of opportunity, the majority of Medical men found it impossible to satisfactorily study the curative powers of Electricity. There was no hospital in the United Kingdom where this valuable branch of science was properly carried out, and, consequently, the Faculty were unable to gain that practical experience and thorough knowledge of the subject which was absolutely necessary to obtain a satisfactory result. Individual doctors were totally unable to carry out Electrical Treatment, except on a very limited scale. It required proper organisation with an Institution like The Medical Battery Company's, where every possible appliance and method of application had been perfected and adopted under the care of a thoroughly efficient staff, whose duties were solely devoted to this purpose. Physicians could confidently send such cases as they considered suitable for Electrical, Mechanical, or other Methods of Cure, to the Company's Electropathic and Zander Institute. After Dr. Vigoureux, Professor Loreau, and Dr. Leeson, had made a few congratulatory remarks, the guests were conducted through the extensive building, and shown the improved Electrical Appliances, Zander Mechanical Exercise Machines (in motion), and many other objects of interest. A sumptuous "cold collation" was served in the Reception Hall by Messrs. Spiers and Pond, and the entertainment concluded with a most successful vocal and instrumental concert, the distinguished artistes being much applauded by an appreciative audience.

A MEETING was held on Thursday, the 14th inst., at the residence of Mr. J. D. Allcroft, 108, Lancaster-gate, W., for the purpose of obtaining support for a fund of £10,000, asked for by the Church Association.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Boddington, Rev. Edward Henry, M.A., Curate of Newbold-on-Stour ; Vicar of Honington, Warwickshire.
Bond, Rev. Canon, Rector of Anderby, Lincolnshire, and Rural Dean ; Vicar of Steeple Ashton, Wiltshire.
Butler, Rev. Charles, Curate-in-Charge ; Vicar of the New Parish of St. Barnabas', Cambridge.
Cruttwell, Rev. Clement A. W., Curate of St. James's, Audlem, Nantwich ; Vicar of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Frankby, Birkenhead.
Cuppage, Rev. R. Jackson, M.A., Rector of North Barsham, Walsingham, Norfolk.
Davis, Rev. Alban Edgar Brunskill, Rector of Brympton, Somersetshire.
Garde, Rev. Christopher Leonard, M.A., Vicar of Skenfrith, Monmouth.
Grub, Rev. G., Incumbent of Stonehaven ; Examining Chaplain to the Primus of Scotland.
Hayden, Rev. John A., Senior Curate of Westoe, South Shields ; Organising Secretary for the North of England of the National Society.
Hughes, Rev. Cecil, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Chorleywood, Herts.
Hunt, Rev. Herbert Falkner, M.A., late Senior Curate of St. Mary-the-Virgin, Reading ; Rector of Southport, Diocese of Brisbane.
Jones, Rev. Frederick Hodgson, Curate of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Altrincham ; Rector of St. Matthias's, Broughton Road, Salford.
Jones, Rev. James Sinnett, B.A., Rector of St. George's-super-Ely.
Kearney, Rev. Arthur Henry, Vicar of Ash-Martock, Somersetshire.
Lawrence, Rev. Thomas Edward, M.A., Curate of Daventry ; Vicar of Lathbury, Bucks.
McNair, Rev. H. B., Vicar of St. Peter's, Earley, near Reading ; Vicar of Aylesbury.
Mee, Rev. J. H., Lecturer at Queen's and Worcester Colleges, Oxford ; Precentor of Chichester Cathedral.
Millard, Rev. Ernest Turner, Vicar of St. Anne's, Wood Plumpton, near Preston.
Morris, Rev. Samuel S. O., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Lion*.
Norfolk, Rev. Alfred Springett, Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class ; Chaplain to the Forces, Third Class.
Oliver, Rev. W. J. R. Hunton, B.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Birmingham.
Pring, Rev. Daniel James, M.A., Vicar of Wilton, Somersetshire.
Richards, Rev. David, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. James's, Upper Bangor ; Minor Canon of St. David's Cathedral, and Curate of the Parish.
Roberts, Rev. J. B., M.A., Vicar of Bronington, near Northwich ; Vicar of Crook, Westmoreland.
Robinson, Rev. Henry Wilson, Vicar of Isleworth, Cambridge.
Sanders, Rev. Charles Lepage, Curate of St. John-the-Baptist's, Pewsey ; Vicar of Charlton All Saints, Salisbury.
Sergeant, Rev. Oswald Pattisson, M.A., Vicar of Chesterton, Oxon.
Shackle, Rev. John Baptist, B.A., Vicar of St. Anne's, Dropmore, Bucks.
Sorby, Rev. A. E., Senior Curate of Sheffield ; Vicar of St. Jude's, Moorfield, Sheffield.
Sowden, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Hebden Bridge ; Rural Dean of Halifax.
Straton, Ven. Archdeacon, Vicar of Wakefield ; Rural Dean of Wakefield.
Trevor, Rev. Thomas Warren, Vicar of Penmon and Llanfaes, and Rural Dean ; Rector of Machynlleth.
Tyndale, Rev. E. F. Guise, M.A., Vicar of Headington, near Oxford ; Vicar of New Shoreham, Sussex.
Vyvyan, Rev. Charles Shimmin, Rector of Landewednack ; Cornwall.
Walford, Rev. C., formerly Chaplain in Her Majesty's India Service ; Vicar of Cherington, Wilts.
Wansbrough, Rev. H. A., M.A., Vicar of Little Walsingham-with-Houghton-in-the-Dale, Norfolk.
Watson, Rev. William Sparrow, M.A., Vicar of Knowle St. Giles, Somersetshire.
Watts, Rev. A., Vice-Principal of Bede College, Durham ; Rector of Wilton Gilbert, Durham.
Wells, Rev. William F., Chaplain to the *Hyacinth*.
Whitby, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Dewsbury ; Rural Dean of Dewsbury.
Wickham, Rev. Archdale Palmer, B.A., Vicar of Martock, Somersetshire.
Winch, Rev. G. T., Curate of Byers-green ; Rector of St. Stephen's, South Shields.
Williams, Rev. W. J., M.A., Vicar of Gainsborough ; Warden of Browne's Hospital, Stamford.
Wilson, Rev. Ralph V., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Devastation*.
Yeld, Rev. Reginald Heart, M.A., Senior Curate of Hendon, Bishopwearmouth ; Vicar of Birtley, Durham.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Coombe, Rev. Alexander Bain, M.A., Oxon, Chaplain H.M. Prison, Armley, at 57, Clarendon Road, Leeds, on the 17th inst., aged 53.
Ewen, Rev. Henry L'Estrange, M.A., late Rector of Offord D'Arcy, Huntingdon, at Swanage, Dorset, on the 15th inst., aged 57.
Francis, Rev. William Adderley, at Little Tey Rectory, on the 14th inst.
Jones, Rev. Herbert Walsingham, Rector of Sculthorpe, Honorary Canon of Norwich Cathedral, third son of the late General Sir J. T. Jones, Bart., K.C.B., of Cranmer, at Sculthorpe, on the 9th inst., aged 62.
Norcock, Rev. Edward H. G., M.A., at the Lodge, Yealmpton, Devon, on the 15th inst., aged 39.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE ARK OF THE COVENANT.

By Rev. Canon LIDDON, D.D.

Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, Sunday, December 23rd, 1888.

"Lo, we heard of the same at Ephrata, and found it in the wood."—Psalm cxxxii. 6.

THE hundred and thirty second Psalm is the last of the six proper Psalms which the Church uses on Christmas Day, and the reason for its selection is probably to be found in the verse before us: "Lo, we heard of the same at Ephrata." Ephrata, or, as it is sometimes written, Ephraim, is an old name of Bethlehem. We are told in Genesis that "Rachael died, and was buried in the way to Ephrata, which is Bethlehem." In their address to Boaz on his marriage with Ruth, the elders of the place bade him to do "worthily in Ephratah and be famous in Bethlehem." In his great prophecy of the nativity, the prophet Micah combines the two names: "But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel." Ephratah, then, is certainly Bethlehem, and as Bethlehem was the birthplace of our Lord and Saviour, and is not referred to by name in any other Psalm, this may have appeared a sufficient reason for the use of this Psalm on Christmas Day.

But here arises the question, Who or what was it that was heard of in Ephratah, and that was found in the fields of the wood? The context makes it clear what the answer must be—it was the Ark of the Covenant. It seems likely that this Psalm, as it now stands, was compiled at some time after the Exile, but compiled out of inspired fragments which had been composed at two or three different periods of the Jewish history. Of these fragments the earliest probably belongs to the age of David, and of this fragment the text is a part. The later compilers recall before God, in David's words, David's vow that he would not rest till he had provided a sanctuary for the God of Jacob: "I will not come into the tabernacle of my house, nor go up into my bed; I will not give sleep to mine eyes, or slumber to mine eyelids, until I find out a place for the Lord, an habitation for the mighty God of Jacob." And then he recalls the words to the people at the time: "Lo, we heard of it"—the Ark—"at Ephratah; we found it in the fields of the wood"—that is, at Kirjath-jearim—"we will go into His tabernacle; and fall low on our knees before His footstool." The period to which these words belong is that which elapsed between the return of the Ark from its seven months' captivity among the Philistines, and its triumphal and solemn conveyance by David to Mount Zion. Is there anything in the Bible history to show that the Ark was during this time, or at any time, at Bethlehem? Certainly the Ark was still a wanderer at a distance from the Tabernacle, of which it was the most important feature. When the Philistines, terror-stricken at the calamities which its presence had brought on them, restored it to Israel, it was for many years kept among different Levitical families who were living on the western frontier of Judah, till, at a great national festival, David conducted it to Jerusalem: but so far as we know, the Ark never in the course of its wanderings, went so far to the south as Bethlehem; nothing would have taken it there between its sojourn at the house of Abinadab at Kirjath-jearim, and its sojourn in the house of Obededom, the Gittite. These localities were, with reference to Bethlehem, far away to the north-west, and the difficulty is not removed by the suggestion that the speakers in the Psalms were themselves at Bethlehem when they heard of the Ark, though the Ark itself was not thought of as being there. But the plain meaning of the language is not that the Ark was heard of by persons at Ephratah, but that it was heard of as being itself at Ephratah. Either, therefore, some incident in the progress of the Ark is here referred to, to which no reference or clue is given us in the historical books of the Old Testament, and for which, apparently, they leave no room; or else, more probably, we have before us a prophetic impulse or inspiration, which, as is the manner of prophecy, loses sight for the moment of its immediate object for a greater object, still more future, of which the former is a type or an anticipation. Of this we have a striking example in our Lord's prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem merging into the acts to take place at the end of the world, in the twenty-fourth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel; and it is at least probable that in the case before us attention is drawn to Bethlehem as the scene in which would be displayed, in a more distant future, a Presence, to which the Ark, as we shall see, pointed onwards, and which should make the little Jewish village famous throughout all time.

Here let us ask ourselves what the Ark was. It was an oblong chest or box, made out of shittim wood, a variety of the acacia, and measured somewhat more than four feet in length, and two in breadth and depth. This chest was entirely covered with plates of gold both inside and out, while on the upper lid was the Mercy Seat, the

throne of the Divine Presence in the midst of Israel, on either side of which were figures of the cherubim, figures, be it observed, that were carved, notwithstanding the Second Commandment, by Divine command. But although the Ark was the most sacred object in the Tabernacle, it was not—if I might rightly so express myself—an original feature in the religion of Israel. Like other things, it had been borrowed from Egypt. To this day may be seen on the walls of ancient temples in Egypt, bas-reliefs of processions in which Egyptian priests are carrying a sacred chest, and the date of these representations is several centuries earlier than the date of Moses. There can be no reasonable doubt that the Ark of the Covenant of Israel was an adaptation to the worship of the one true God of this feature of the old Egyptian religion, and there is no reason why such a fact as this should be recorded as a difficulty to face. Inspiration, as I have said before, does not always take the form of original suggestion; it is not infrequently guidance in selection; it teaches how to choose out of a mixed mass of material those elements which will illustrate, or which will harmoniously combine, with the true religion. In this way the authors of the Books of Kings and Chronicles were guided to incorporate with their work certain documents which already existed, while they laid others on one side; and St. Paul was taught to retain and to use certain arguments which he had learnt in the Rabbinical schools at Jerusalem, while he declined to employ others, and to sanction certain features of the thought and language of ancient Greece, while ignoring or condemning the rest. The idea that all the thought, all the usages of the old heathen religions were equally bad, was never bluntly stated until some Puritan divine stated it in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries: Tertullian, perhaps, comes near to doing so in the third century. The Puritan divines were quarrelling with the Church, among other things, for those usages which she still retains in common with certain heathen religions, for instance, as the use of the surplice. But in that day men did not know enough to understand how seriously this objection of theirs, if it was an objection at all, told against the Bible. We know now that all heathen systems, instead of being wholly false, are in very different proportions conglomerates of falsehood and truth, and so differ, on the one hand, from the Christian revelation, which is wholly true, and from pure atheism, which is wholly false; and when Moses was guided, in the worship of the true God, to the Egyptian symbol of a consecrated chest or ark, he was obeying one of the most common forms of inspiration—the inspiration of selection.

In the days to which the Psalmist's words refer the Ark provided satisfaction for certain instincts of the human soul which any powerful and lasting religion must satisfy in some way or other. The first demand of the soul is that a religion shall be true, and the second that it shall provide some demonstrative and efficient means of communication with Him who is the object of religion—the infinite and eternal God.

But beside these primary demands there are others of a subordinate kind, to which I now refer. The idea of God kindled in the soul the sense of beauty, and beauty that meets the eye suggests the immaterial beauty of the invisible and unseen. No religion can afford, in the long run, to neglect this instinct of the soul of man. There is no revealed connection between religious truth or real spirituality, on the one hand, and slovenliness or deformity on the other.

Then, again, the eternity of God kindled in the soul a reverence for antiquity, as the best sort of approach that we on earth can make to God's eternal years. And so all powerful and lasting religions have sought sooner or later the sanction of antiquity. Christianity did so in its earliest days by linking itself on to the Scriptures of Judaism; its Founder proclaimed: "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil them."

And once more the Divine Being, awful, remote, inaccessible, suggests to man that any religion that really reflects His mind must have attached to it an element of mystery. A religion which, as peoples' speech, should be plain and intelligible from beginning to end, presenting no difficulties, suggesting no unanswered questions to a finite understanding like ours, however respectable as the work of a manufacturer of religion of human origin would carry on its front the proclamation and certificate of falsehood, if it should dare to lay claim to Divine authority, or should undertake to provide satisfaction for the soul of man.

Well, in these three respects the Ark largely satisfied the religious needs of Israel. It was, to begin with, a beautiful object, beautiful in itself, and especially with relation to the Holy Presence that o'ershadowed it. Next, in David's time, it was already ancient. It had shared the weary and anxious fortunes of Israel in the desert, and during its sojourn in Shiloh it gathered round it a large stock of religious and national associations; and thirdly, there was an element of mystery that hung about it. It was shrouded from popular sight by prescribed coverings; its contents, and the Presence which accompanied it, were alike suggestive of much beyond. The mystery which surrounded it, and which especially attached to the mercy-seat above it, drew towards it the hearts of Israel with mingled feelings of love and awe. When, as in the case of Uzzah, they ventured to break through the awful reverence which should have protected it from profane handling or intrusion, they had to pay a swift and heavy penalty.

But here it becomes necessary to go more into

detail, and by way of doing so we may observe that the Ark of the Covenant of this shape, these dimensions, this historical origin, this beautiful, ancient, mysterious mercy-seat, was in two respects essentially remarkable.

It was remarkable, first of all, on account of its contents. These were in the early ages of Israel threefold. First, there were the Tables of the Law, written by the finger of God. Next, we are told in the Epistle to the Hebrews, there was Aaron's rod that budded, and the pot of manna. These had certainly been ordered to be kept before the Testimony or Tables of the Law, but it would seem that in Solomon's days they had disappeared, as at the dedication of the Temple we are expressly told that there was nothing in the Ark but the two Tables of the Law. Each of these relics reminded Israel of a serious truth. Aaron's rod was the symbol of Israel's communion with God in sacrifice and prayer, since it witnessed to the Divine authority of the Jewish priesthood. The pot of manna was the symbol of Israel's dependence upon God for material as well as spiritual blessings. It recalled to them the Divine bounty which had saved Israel from famine in the desert. But the most important, as well as the most prominent of the contents of the Ark, was the Tables of the Law, before which the rod and manna were laid out. The preservation of these Tables in the Ark implied, not only that the precepts inscribed on them were obligatory upon the conscience of Israel, it showed in a vivid and striking way that the moral law was the most sacred thing in Israel, as being a statement in human speech, not only of the will, but of the nature of God. The Tables of the Law were thus a symbol of the essential holiness of God, that attribute which the highest intelligences of heaven incessantly adore—"Holy, holy, holy."

And, secondly, the Ark was remarkable for the Presence which rested on it. It was the support of the Mercy Seat. Certainly it enclosed the letter of the Covenant, on the observance of which the Divine mercy rested; but this symbolical meaning of the Ark was emphasized by an appearance between the cherubim manifesting so much of the beauty and glory of God as it was possible for His creatures to witness in this mortal state. On particular occasions there appeared a light of extraordinary brightness, but, for the most part, this light was shrouded in a cloud, which alone was visible. This the later Jews called the Shechinah—meaning, as the word implies, that it rested or dwelt here below, and implying that it originally belonged to a higher than earthly sphere. This particular manifestation of the Divine presence accompanied the Israelites from Egypt at the Exodus: it added not a little to the confusion of the Egyptians when in pursuit of them; it finally took possession of the Tabernacle at its completion, just as in after years, at the dedication of the Temple of Solomon the "cloud filled the house of the Lord, so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud; for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord." While there is no reason for thinking that either in the Tabernacle or the first Temple the cloud was ever withdrawn from its place between the cherubim, it is clear that the overpowering light which it concealed was only made visible on rare occasions. Even when Moses heard the voice of one speaking unto him from off the Mercy Seat that was upon the Ark of the testimony, from between the two cherubim, the radiance of the Shechinah does not seem to have appeared; but it flashed forth from the surrounding cloud before the descent of the manna, and at the first sacrifice offered by Aaron after his consecration, when we are told the glory of the Lord appeared to all the people. Sometimes it appeared as a sign of the Divine displeasure, as when the people proposed to stone Joshua and Caleb on their return from the Promised Land; or when Korah and his fellow rebels gathered themselves together against the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation; or when the people murmured against Moses and Aaron in Kadesh; on all these occasions the glory—that is the brilliant light which was concealed by the cloud of the Tabernacle—is said to have become visible either to the whole population, or to those immediately around or within the Tabernacle. Those who seriously believe that the Author of the moral world is also the Author and Ruler of the natural world, will scarcely dispute His right thus to employ the resources, the aspects, the effects of Nature in the interests of His moral government. We cannot tell how deeply this feature of Israel's government took possession of devout minds. This was the meaning of the cry of agony when the Chaldean nation oppressed them. "Show Thyself, Thou who sittest upon the cherubim." This was the point of their belief in the power of prayer in the early days when God "spake unto them out of the cloudy pillar; for they kept His testimonies and the law that He gave them." This was the secret in the chaunt of triumph when the sons of Kobath lifted the sacred ark and it moved forward in procession:—"Let God arise, and let His enemies be scattered; let them also that hate Him flee before Him." This explains the language in which the poet of a later age describes the supreme humiliation which broke the heart of the old high priest Eli, when God "delivered their power into captivity and their beauty into the enemy's hand." Here we see the peculiar malignity of the idolatry of which the Israelites were guilty at the foot of Sinai, when "they made a calf in Horeb and worshipped the molten image. Thus they turned their glory into the similitude of a calf that eateth hay." And so in the Psalm before us, no sooner is the Ark referred to than the Psalmist adds, "we will go into His Tabernacle and fall low on our

knees before His footstool," that is, before the Ark which was beneath the sacred Presence. "Arise," he continues, "O Lord, into Thy resting-place, Thou and the Ark of Thy strength." Indeed, the Shechinah which rested on the Mercy Seat will alone explain the peculiar fervour of the devotional language about the Temple or the Tabernacle which so often meets us in the Psalter. The Shechinah made the sense of the presence of God, His holiness, his justice, His mercy, vivid to the mind of the pious Israelite; it made him fear to approach that awful and at times manifested Presence in a condition of conscious disobedience or moral pollution. "Lord, who shall dwell in Thy Tabernacle, or who shall rest upon Thy holy hill? Even he that leadeth an uncorrupt life, and doeth the thing which is right, and speaketh the truth from his heart. He that hath used no deceit in his tongue, nor done evil to his neighbour, and hath not slandered his neighbour. He that setteth not by himself, but is lowly in his own eyes, and maketh much of them that fear the Lord. He that sweareth unto his neighbour, and disappointeth him not, though it were to his own hindrance. He that hath not given his money upon usury, nor taken reward against the innocent. Whoso doeth these things shall never fail." And yet, while the Presence on the Ark thus awed the Israelite into moral obedience, it attracted him with a fascination which he felt himself most keenly when he was separated from it. Thus David: "One thing have I desired of the Lord, which I will require, even that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the fair beauty of the Lord, and to visit His temple." And a later psalmist in the temporary exile: "Like as the hart desireth the water brooks, so longeth my soul after thee, O God. My soul is athirst for God, yea, even for the living God. When shall I come to appear before the presence of God?" And so another psalmist, at a distance from Jerusalem, but certainly before the Babylonian exile: "O how amiable are Thy dwellings, Thou Lord of hosts! My soul hath a desire and longing to enter into the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh rejoice in the living God. Yea, the sparrow hath found her an house, and the swallow a nest where she may lay her young. Even Thy altars, O Lord of hosts, my King and my God. Blessed are they that dwell in Thy house; they will be always praising Thee."

For those who believe that the people of Israel was eventually the subject of a Divine education—an education which was suited to its high function as the people of revelation, it is impossible to ignore the importance of this feature of the religion of Israel. As the tables within the Ark reminded the Israelite of the supreme importance of moral truth, so the cloud on the Mercy Seat above the Ark reminded him of a particular mode of the presence of the omnipresent Being which was vouchsafed to Israel. Year by year, generation after generation, Israel was accustomed to associate the presence of Him whom the heaven and the heaven of heavens, as his own prophet said, could not contain, with a particular spot, a particular outward form, a particular occasional manifestation. Would not this have been leading men's thoughts in a direction the opposite to that of the spirituality and immateriality of God unless God had proposed to manifest Himself to man after a manner for which the Ark and the Shechinah would act as a preparation: in other words, does not this feature of the religion of Israel only become intelligible when we place it in the light of the Divine Incarnation? That the writers of the New Testament were of this mind becomes clear when we look closely at their language. When St. John tells us that the "Word was made flesh, &c.," to render it literally, "tabernacled among us, and we beheld His glory," we cannot but observe that this language is so chosen as to recall the glory which rested on the Ark of the Covenant, and the days when, in the ancient language, the tent or tabernacle of God had a first place in the thought of Israel. And when we read in the Apocalypse with reference to our Lord's manifestation in the flesh the announcement: "Behold the Tabernacle of God is with men, and He will tabernacle with them," it is impossible to ignore the connection between the Shechinah on the Ark in the Tabernacle and the Divine Incarnation.

Now, had the Ark, with its sacred contents and the Shechinah resting on it, continued to be a leading feature of the interior furniture of the Holy Place in the Temple until our Lord's time, there might have been in pious minds trained in the old religion of Israel, a rivalry between the presence in the Ark and the higher presence in Jesus of Nazareth, a rivalry such as existed, as we know, from the Epistle to the Hebrews, between the still-continuing Jewish sacrifices and the great sacrifice on Calvary, with its continuous celebration in the Church of God. But, in point of fact, the distinctive glory of the Ark vanished at the destruction of Solomon's Temple. In the Temple which was built after the exile, there was, it seems, no Ark, no Tables of the Law, no Shechinah; the outward structure of Solomon's Temple was copied in the most minute details; but the symbols of Divine presence and authority were wanting. Even architecture could not atone for deficiency in religious privileges, and the Jews of the days which followed the exile were deeply sensible of the loss, and so Haggai cries in his address to Joshua and Zerubabel, "Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory? and how do ye see it now? Is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing?" It was in view of this that Isaiah prophesied the return of the Shechinah in some sense in the days of the Messiah. "The Lord will create upon every

dwelling-place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night." And Ezekiel, in the vision of the return of the glory of the Temple through the Eastern gate was assured that God would dwell in the midst of Israel for ever. And so after the exile God promised Zechariah, "Lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee;" and by Haggai, "I will fill the house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts;" and "The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts." Considering the patent deficiencies of the new Temple when compared with the old, it was difficult to see how these predictions could be realised, and, accordingly, even the Jewish interpreters had no hesitation in saying that they would, in some way, become true in the days of the King Messiah.

And thus we see how, first of all, the gift of the sacred Ark, and its accompanying prerogatives, and next its withdrawal for some six hundred years from the midst of Israel, might lead devout minds to the feet of our Lord and Saviour. First, to kindle the heart, and train it to a religious desire for some intimate manifestation of the presence of God, and then to withdraw the Ark, and leave Israel with its desire keener than ever, and yet unsatisfied. Certainly every precious thing in ancient Israel ultimately led to Christ — not only that direct prediction which foretold His lineage, birth, work, character, suffering, death, resurrection, triumph; not only sacrificial rites, which had no meaning apart from the immense significance which his sacrificial death would flash back on them after the lapse of ages; not only a long line of servants of God, saints, prophets, each exhibiting with imperfection some especial form of moral excellence, while all such excellencies, without any of the accompanying imperfections, found a place in Him; but also the Ark pointed to Him by its contents, and by the Presence that rested on it. The rod of Aaron might suggest His priesthood, which was not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the powers of an endless life; and the pot of manna befits one who could say of himself: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever, and the bread which I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." But the Tables of the Covenant especially direct our eyes to Him who alone perfectly fulfilled them, for though that awful record of the Divine Will, when interpreted by the enlightened and sensitive conscience, could not but suggest a self-accusing sentence of condemnation, He could read it unmoved, and could challenge the world—"Which of you convinceth Me of sin? I do always those things that please Him." His holy manhood was an ark within which the spirit, as well as the letter of the moral law, was preserved inviolate. He not merely obeyed, but lived the law; it was incorporate with the pulsations of His heart, with the fibres of His moral life. The Jewish Ark was robbed of its contents before Solomon's time; the rod and manna had disappeared; the Tables of the Covenant did not outlive Nebuchadnezzar; but Jesus Christ is "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," for ever the priest and the food of His people; and the eternal moral law of God is for ever the law of His life in glory.

And still more does the presence which rested on the Ark between the cherubim suggest the entire Divine nature which from the first moment of our Lord's earthly life was joined indissolubly to His manhood. Often, indeed, during that life men saw only the unilluminated cloud, and they asked: "Is not this Joseph's son, and is not His mother called Mary, and His brethren are they not with us?" if, indeed, His visage did not seem to them marked more than any man's, and His form more conspicuous than the sons of men. But at times the brightness from within the cloud flashed upon them, as by the tomb of Lazarus, as on the Mount of Transfiguration, as at the door of the empty sepulchre, or when He said: "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father," or "I and the Father are one," or "Before Abraham was I am," or "No man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son," or "If any man love Me, My Father will love him, and we will come unto Him and make our abode with Him."

Nor will those who believe that nothing in Holy Scripture is without its purpose fail to observe how in His earthly life our Lord was pleased to associate with Himself two of the accompaniments of the Presence which rested on the Ark—the overshadowing cloud on the Mount of Transfiguration, and the cloud which received Him out of the sight of His disciples on the Mount of the Ascension. His saying to the high priest, "Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven," and the warning of His apostle, "Behold He cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see Him"—these mark the one. And on the other hand, the cherubim and the glory overshadowing the mercy-seat prepare us for the angels that heralded the Nativity, for the angels that ministered at the Temptation, for the great angels of the agony, for the angels of the sepulchre, for the angels who met the men of Galilee after the Ascension with the warning that Jesus would return, for the prediction that the Son of Man should "come in His glory, and all His holy angels with Him." It was because Jesus then amply restored all and more than all which had been lost in the second Temple than even at His birth He was hailed by Jewish believers like aged Simeon, as not merely destined to be "a light to lighten the Gentiles," but also, and especially, to be "the glory," in the ancient sense of that word,

which applied it to the Shechinah, and "the glory of His people Israel."

The history of the Ark and that particular chapter to which the text refers us suggests one more point for consideration. It was natural that the Israelites should be deeply impressed with the mysterious power attaching to the Ark of the Covenant and should assume that it would be in all circumstances guarded against outrage. From this it was but a step to ask the question: "Can we not make use of this for other purposes than that for which it was given?" Meant to be a representation in the midst of Israel of the presence, of the sanctity, the mercy of God, can we not, for instance, make it an engine of war, of offensive or defensive war, so that the enemies of Israel shall quail before a might that is more than human? It was an evil hour when, after their defeat by the Philistines at Ebenezer, the elders of Israel said: "Wherefore hath the Lord smitten us to-day before the Philistines? Let us fetch the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord out of Shiloh unto us, that, when if cometh among us, it may save us out of the hand of our enemies." The Ark came, as we know, attended by the dissolute sons of Eli. The loud acclamations in the camp of Israel on its arrival carried terror for a moment into the hearts of Israel's enemies, but in the event Israel was defeated with a greater slaughter than before, and the Ark of the Lord fell into the hands of the Pagan conquerors. The name of Ichabod, born at this same crisis in the national history, marks the true character of the calamity—"the glory is departed from Israel." And in after ages inspired poets told how God took sore displeasure at Israel's false worship. "So that He forsook the Tabernacle in Silo, even the tent that He had pitched among men. He delivered their power into captivity and their beauty into the enemy's hand." Israel committed the same mistake at a later time, when it made up its mind that the promised Messiah, the antitype of the Ark, could be made useful for merely political objects which were ardently desired by the nation. One main reason for the rejection of our Lord, in whom all the promises and predictions of the Messiah were really satisfied, was that He declared His kingdom was not of this world, and that, therefore, He could not be turned to account in this way. The most emphatic instance of this illusion occurred after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the aged Rabbi Aquiba, perhaps the greatest doctor of the Jewish schools, proclaimed the insurgent Barcochebas as the true Messiah. At the head of two hundred thousand warriors Barcochebas shook the Roman authority in Syria to its very foundation, but the generals of the Emperor Hadrian reduced him, after terrific slaughter, to complete submission, and the Rabbi Aquiba was put to death of torture, which obliterates to our mind the memory of his mistake. And we Christians are guilty of the same fault when we attempt to use our creed for the purposes of worldly advancement, or imagine that its publication will protect us from danger if we engage in doubtful courses of conduct. It is but too easy to carry the Ark of God into the thick of the contest when neither combatant can reasonably hope to be in entire accordance with God's will. In their very different ways Oliver Cromwell and Louis XIV. carried the Ark into the battle which they waged against their opponents, and the impression which they left upon men's minds was seen in the ostentation of religion that did so much to discredit the Restoration, and in the widespread religious infidelity which preceded the French Revolution. Religious professions which are in conflict with the general conduct of those who make them do not defeat the enemies of religion; rather they betray religion into the hands of its enemies. The sacred Ark should never be made to fight the world's battles. God punishes the attempt to enlist it in such a cause, though in the moment of disaster He knows how to guard His own honour, and how eventually to recover His throne in the hearts of men.

"Lo, we heard of the same at Ephrata." So far, then, as the Ark of the Covenant was concerned in these more ancient days, it was apparently a false report suggested by some pious peasant who was jealous for the honour of the house of David. In these more ancient days the glory of Bethlehem undoubtedly paled before that of the city of the woods, Kirjath-jearim. But in view of Him, of whom the Ark is but as a living counterpart, the greatest of the descendants of David, David's Son and yet David's Lord, it was not a false report. That prediction was lighting unconsciously upon a deeper truth than the speaker thought, and Ephrata was only to bide its time in order to eclipse the glories not merely of Kirjath-jearim but of Zion itself. There, in the outskirts of the little Judæan village, in the lowly manger, scooped out, after the fashion of the country, between or beneath the layers of the limestone rock; there the mother laid the Divine Saviour of the world: and thither, year by year, for eighteen centuries and more, in thought and will, if not in deed, Christians have sped to join the shepherds, and while they worship their Lord Incarnate, the One Man who has kept inviolate the eternal moral law of God, and the overshadowing presence of the Godhead, they offer Him the homage of their hearts and lives. Let us, too, with our tribute penitence and love—let us join this great company of pilgrims, belonging to so many climes and ages, in our early communion on Christmas morning; let us go into His true tabernacle, let us fall low on our knees before His footstool. Let us now go even unto Bethlehem, and see the thing which has come to pass, and which the Lord hath made known!

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE,** or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW,** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary, **OBESITY IS CURED,** and will be sent, **gratis and post free,** on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.

(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 1889.

THE ANGELS OF THE CHURCHES.

PROBABLY no person is ever entirely free from bias, while considering a text, which may have a decisive effect on an important point of controversy. But each man will make the nearest possible approach to impartiality, if he knows what his own bias is, and makes sufficient allowance for it. Now the passages in the Book of Revelation, which speak of the Angels of the Churches, are a cardinal text, upon which depends a most important question. If those angels were human beings, then each was a single official in charge of the Christian Church in one of the seven cities of the province of Asia, and, consequently, an office identical with monarchical episcopacy existed already in that province in the latter part of the apostolic age, and is presumably of apostolic origin. The present writer is conscious of a very strong desire that the ultimate result of historical investigation may be to prove that monarchical episcopacy is not apostolic, or at least not directly divine. Not that he is blind to the merits of that form of Church organisation under which he himself has been born, and lived, and laboured. On the contrary, he fully appreciates its many excellencies. But he thinks that he can see very plainly, that neither Christ, nor His apostles, imposed upon the Church any form of organisation whatever, but left it entirely free to adapt itself to the varying circumstances of the world; and he also thinks that in the frank and full admission of this fact lies the only hope of the reunion of Christendom. The fundamental cause of disunion seems to him to be exclusive pretensions—first that of Rome, claiming a universal dominion for the *Cathedra Petri*, and, secondly, that of the Anglican body, unchurching all Christian bodies, which are not episcopally organised. If these two pretensions were abandoned there would be no further obstacle to a very wide comprehension and intercommunion. Supposing that the Anglican claim were dismissed, episcopacy would no longer stand forward as a directly divine institution; but a bishop would still be a power that has come into into existence through the providence of God, and therefore is indirectly divine. His position would be analogous to that of an English king or queen, whose subjects still pay him loyal reverence, and treat him as ruling by the grace of God, though they no longer believe royalty to be a divine ordinance for all mankind; but consider Mr. Cleveland or M. Carnot to be, in relation to their own citizens, as legitimate potentates as Queen Victoria. It is as one of the two great existing obstacles to reunion that this writer earnestly hopes that the strict Anglican theory may fall. Yet, while admitting this bias, he hopes so to allow for it, while discussing a text which is one of that theory's main pillars, as to escape the danger of perverting facts.

The question to be answered is a very simple one. What did the writer of the Apocalypse mean by the expression ἄγγελοι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν?

There appear to be three answers possible. 1. That already noted, human beings responsible for the government of the Churches. 2. Supernatural beings, acting as guardians of those Churches. 3. Ideal beings, personifications or symbols.

The meaning of the word should be determined by considering—In what sense did this writer use the word ἄγγελος elsewhere in his writings? We will look first to the Apocalypse alone, not meddling at all with the question whether the writer of that book is the same man who wrote the Gospel and the Epistles. On this point our material is ample. The writer uses the word ἄγγελος over seventy times, and in no other case, except the eight verses in which the Angels of the Churches are mentioned, is there the slightest possibility of his meaning a human being. There are angels in the sun and the sky, angels before the throne of God. There is Michael with his corps of angels above, and the dragon with his rival army of angels contending with them from below. There are angels of heaven against angels of the abyss. There are also angels of the waters, and of the winds, and of the fire; angels that cause tempests, and pestilences, eruptions and earthquakes. In fact, as was the case with the later Hebrews, the whole universe is for him alive with angels, and they form the principal *dramatis personæ* of his prophetic poem. The question may be asked—Did he suppose these angels to have been really existing beings, or only personifications—personifications of the various powers of good and evil, both in nature

and in grace, of the attributes and acts of God, of the resistance of evil to His gracious purposes, of the functions of nature which do good or ill to man? It is impossible to answer this question; indeed, it is doubtful whether an apocalyptic writer would ever attempt himself to define his vague, though grandiose visions. One thing is perfectly certain, that, if we subtract the eight verses, in which the Angels of the Churches are mentioned, there is no other passage in the book, in which ἄγγελος can possibly mean a man.

The use of ἄγγελος in other parts of the New Testament harmonises with that in the Apocalypse. Excepting those passages, where the word means simply and prosaically a messenger, it nowhere signifies a human being, but always either a supernatural being or a personification.

The writer of the Apocalypse was one who thought in a Semitic language. Therefore, the word present to his mind, which he translated ἄγγελος, was מַלְאָךְ, and the use of the latter word in the Old Testament is as important in determining his meaning as the use of the former in the New. Now מַלְאָךְ and ἄγγελος are exact equivalents, each possessing the same lower and the same higher meaning. When מַלְאָךְ is used of a human being it means simply a messenger, as in Job i. 14, and many other places. It is nowhere the appellative name of any higher office. When applied to a priest (Mal. ii. 7, 8), or to a prophet (Is. xlii. 19; xliv. 26; Hag. i. 13; Mal. iii. 1), it merely describes a function of each of these offices —bringing to men messages from above; but it is not the title by which either office was distinguished. It is sometimes thought that Eccles. v. 6 is an exception to this rule, and the angel in that text a priest. But, considering the belief of the later Jews that angels were present everywhere, and especially in congregations met for worship, it is surely more natural to think that Koheleth meant the supernatural being, who was supposed to haunt the assembly and to witness the vow just as St. Paul (i. Cor. xi. 10) employed the same current idea as an argument to recommend propriety of dress to women—the angels would see them and be offended at their semi-masculine attire.

But it is conceivable that there might be a traditional interpretation, opposed to that which I am recommending, so weighty and constant as to indicate an universal belief in the early Church, that these angels were bishops. On the contrary, the evidence of tradition favours the other side. Origen, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Jerome, each treats these as actual angels, none of those writers giving the slightest indication that he had ever heard of another interpretation (Origen, Hom. xiii. in Luc., Hom. xx. in Num., Greg. Naz., Or. 42. Jerome, in Mich. Proph., cap. 6.), while the most ancient authority on the other side is Primasius, a writer of the middle of the sixth century.

But it is said that the language used in the Epistles to the angels is such as could only be addressed to an individual, and him a human being, capable of sin and liable to death. The singular number is used in each epistle, exhortations are addressed, faults marked, and punishments denounced, as they could only be to an individual human being. This is true of the beginning of each epistle; but in the middle of one of them (ii. 24), the plural is introduced and collective faults rebuked. And the warning with which each concludes is addressed not to a single person, but generally to the *Ecclesia*. The probable truth is that which was seen by Andreas and Arellas, ancient writers, though of uncertain date, that the angels are personifications of the churches themselves, like the angels of fire, wind, and water, and that the admonitions which the churches required are addressed to them as their representatives. W. E. RAWSTORNE.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Collect for Quinquagesima Sunday.

This Collect, drawn up by the Reformers in 1549, and substituted for the earlier one which occupied this position, is one of the most beautiful that our Prayer-book contains. In this mercenary nineteenth century, when all seems bustle and turmoil, it sounds refreshing to ears wearied with the babel of the market-place. In these days when men put themselves first, when it seems well-nigh impossible to stay one's steps in the race of life to attend to the wounds of the wayfarer who falls at our side; when one must be *First* or nothing, it is sweet to be reminded that there *is* a higher law than the world teaches. We lose nothing by learning that success is after all not *all* that is to be desired; that many who are "last" in the eyes of world shall prove to be "first," when the clearer light of the world to come shines upon their path. Then shall we know that love, not selfishness; self-denial, not self-advancement, is the real golden key which opens the gate of the "Everlasting Habitations." And this "most excellent gift of Charity"—what is it? Does it mean heading a subscription with a handsome donation which we shall never miss? Is it the sending some scraps of food, which we cannot use, to the poor? No, surely, these things, good enough in their way; the tithe of mint, anise, and cummin which must not be omitted, are still not the weightier matters of the law. They are not "Charity." Rather is it, as has been well said, "A principle of prevailing love to God, and goodwill to men." If this be true, how earnestly should we pray for this gift. Still more when we consider that as our Collect has it, it is even more than this—"the very bond of peace and of all virtues." It is, as it were, the girdle which binds all our other graces into a consistent whole; it is the completion of our Christian armour; a weapon indeed of such strength and power, that, having it, we may hope to return victorious from the fray. While, without it, though having all else, we are exposed to every dart of

the enemy. Let us, then, as we endeavour by prayerful self-examination to profit by Lent, see to it, that we omit not to try our skill in the use of this weapon. Oh! let us try to copy more our dear Lord, the perfect God-man, the great Examplar of the Divine charity. Let us strive that in *every particular* we may show that the Holy Spirit has heard our earnest prayer, and bestowed upon us in a very full measure this grace of love, first to God and then through Him to our fellow-man.

RELIGIOUS ANIMOSITY.

By W. WALTERS, Esq., B.A., London.

At a meeting held some years ago, a high ecclesiastical dignity made a speech touching upon the questions of doctrine and ritual which for some years past have engaged the attention of members of the English Church. The burden of his address was, "Let your moderation be known unto all men," and with that scripture precept he supported his advice, recommending mutual forbearance. Such counsel was not satisfactory to many of his hearers; uncompromising persons as they were themselves, they looked for a distinct condemnation of their opponents, and a no less emphatic approval of their own party.

It is well known that moderate opinions never do find favour during the course of an important struggle. One proposing such views is looked upon in both camps as an enemy; or at least as a secret ally of the foe, who is only waiting a favourable moment to declare his hostility. Somehow, however, the *via media* is the one that is, generally speaking, adopted in the end, because truth rarely lies in extremes, and because no single class of ideas can permanently influence society. Moderation is often confounded with hesitation, indifference, and even with contempt of truth; and it may be allowed that a middle course is frequently taken because people fail to see the proper tendency of their principles, or because they fear that a declaration in favour of one or the other side would alienate friends and widen differences. But moderation proceeding from principle sees and acknowledges the proportion of truth which differing opinions contain, at the same time that it is conscious of weaknesses and fallacies in each. By taking a middle course it aims at combining the fragments of truth that are possessed by opposing factions, with the hope also of keeping clear of their respective errors. Such is the moderation advocated by the prelate. If unity can be maintained without giving countenance to error, and devotion to the Master combined with love to one another as fellow disciples of the same Master, no effort should be spared to bring such a result about.

A series of agencies has been at work in preparing the way for a change in that settled order of Church affairs which has prevailed for the last two centuries. Foremost is the revival of Art. The study of the glorious works of past ages led to a desire of reproducing them. Familiarity with the outward instruments by which an earlier worship was realized drew the minds of men to investigate the nature of the ritual of which they were the accompaniments and the instruments. As the perception of what is beautiful gained strength people became ashamed of the surpassing ugliness of their buildings and notably of their ecclesiastical structures. They fell back on the ancient type of church architecture called "Gothic," and in this way tried to realise their desire for better things. In proportion as the building drew nearer to the mediæval standard so was it found that the service also must be changed. The raised chancel, the procession path, the high altar, the cruciform embellishments were not needed for a simple recitation of prayer and delivery of a sermon. In a word, Catholic ritual appeared to be the only one suited to a Catholic edifice. It was no doubt felt that many of the objects which lent beauty to the old service—the crosses, the censers, the vestments, the banners—could find no place in a Protestant order of daily prayer; and whilst their presence was seen to be essential to the sure realisation of the effect of that worship in a mediæval building such as they now had, it became a necessity to restore the old ceremonial as far as time and circumstances would allow of. Nor is this to be charged as a fault against the Established Church alone; the various dissenting bodies have been for years bringing their places of worship more and more into conformity with the mediæval type of ecclesiastical structure. In proportion as our taste for what is beautiful manifested itself, just in so great a degree has a desire been felt that the House of God and divine service should not be left bald and even repulsive through utter want of attention to what is fitting and ornamental. That this new development should have taken a mediæval direction is an accident; the Renaissance style has been adopted in a recently-built church.

People become familiar with the masterpiece of Catholic church music and desire more elaborate composition than the hymn tune in their own services. Archæology induces reverence for antiquity, and so the Abbey, ruthlessly demolished by Reformation mobs, becomes in these days a thing venerated. Crosses and thurifers, at first objects of curiosity, in the end become incentives to a restoration of the ancient cult. Persons of æsthetic turn, used to plain and unvarying service, feel their whole being affected by the gorgeous ceremonies of the Mass. We are better acquainted than our fathers with early Church history, we have studied the ancient Liturgies, and their general correspondence leads men to think that somehow the eighteenth century worship did not accord with that of the second.

The horror caused by the Marian persecution, the Gunpowder plot and so on, has gradually been wearing away from men's recollections, and to the mass of the people Roman Catholicism is but one of the many prevalent forms of dissent, and the word Catholic, in its restricted sense, is not hated as it once was. It is felt too, perhaps, that justice has not been always done to those who professed that faith in former times, whilst grave doubts occur to the minds of many whether a considerable portion of the gloomy and odious tales respecting them may not be fabulous. A reaction has thus taken place with regard to the way in which Catholicism is to be viewed, and so, step by step, multitudes have learned to look with favour on that system, and to strive that their own might be approximated to it.

(*To be continued.*)

The *Church Review* says it is stated that a coadjutor Bishop is about to be appointed for the diocese of St. Andrews, in consequence of the failing health of Bishop Charles Wordsworth, who was consecrated in 1853.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

JONAH'S HISTORY.

SIR,—Your correspondent questions the relevancy of my quotation from "The Speaker's Commentary." I will endeavour to reply, only premising that his apparent want of acquaintance with modern critical investigations and their result renders it difficult to be concise.

In approaching for critical purposes any part of the Old Testament, it must obviously be approached without prejudice or prepossession. To overrule the inquiry by subjecting it to theological influences derived from the New Testament would be in the highest degree misleading. If we would rightly appreciate the Book of Jonah we must come to it unfettered and free.

Well, then, on unbiassed examination, we find in it a dramatic narrative of a peculiar and well-known kind. It is eminently didactic, possesses a perfect unity of structure, and is characterised by miraculous machinery of the most startling and grotesque kind, as well as by the utmost degree of historical improbability. It has all the characteristics of an Oriental apologue, used as the vehicle of moral or religious instruction. We know that this mode of teaching was very common with the Jewish Rabbis subsequent to the Captivity, to which period the book, as we have it, probably belongs, although the basis of the story is not unlikely to be older, and possibly may be connected with some ancient solar myth. However that may be, its general resemblance to the Rabbinical literature is evident. Of similar didactic stories, whether grotesquely miraculous or only marvellous, we have instances within the Alexandrine Canon, in the romances of Tobit and Judith. Within the Hebrew Canon itself we have almost certainly one in the Book of Esther, and another perhaps in the Book of Ruth. But not one of these, or of others which may be found in the writings of the Rabbis, is more decisively marked with the characteristics of the apologue than the Book of Jonah. Not simply because it is miraculous, for to the orthodox and believing critic that in itself is no stumbling-block. But the miracles in it are so prodigious, so out of proportion to their motives, as almost to compel one to see in them the play of Oriental imagination rather than the sober narration of fact. Again, the story of the conversion of haughty Nineveh and its mighty despot, at the call of an unknown foreign prophet, is in the teeth of all historical probability. To be convinced of its incredibility, it is enough, as Professor Cheyne says, to read any inscription of an Assyrian king. Not that the book is any the less inspired for all this; it shows us inspiration teaching through apologue and romantic fiction, as elsewhere through history and biography. And, so far from such an extension of the methods of inspiration being unlikely or dangerous, it is an idea to which critical research into the growth of the Old Testament is more and more leading us.

Suppose, now, that careful, independent research has brought us to think that in all probability the Book of Jonah has the character thus briefly described, what is there in the New Testament to preclude us from maintaining this view? Our Lord makes two allusions to the book to give point to His teaching. Why should he not do so, just as much on the theory that the familiar story is a divinely-inspired apologue, as on the theory that it is a narrative of literal fact? Can anyone seriously imagine that to our Lord's human mind our modern critical questions were present, and that His practical use of a recorded and striking incident necessarily stamps it, and was intended by him to stamp it, as an absolute fact. Why in this should His method differ from the method of the approved teachers of His nation, to whom, as my extract said, "the doctrine is everything, the mode of presentation has no independent value?" Did not St. Paul use a palpable Jewish legend, in speaking of the rock which followed Israel all through their desert wanderings, and St. Jude another, in drawing a lesson from Michael's conduct, when disputing with the devil about the body of Moses? So far from there being a danger of our Lord's words being discredited, simply because of His employing illustrations drawn from a familiar and accepted, though in reality fictitious, narrative, it seems to me that the danger lies in the other direction—that of rendering our theology irrational, by forcing it into a hopeless conflict with the results of matured historical and critical science.

PRESBYTER.

SIR,—It appears to me most likely that the words ascribed to our Lord about Jonah in the whale's belly were never spoken by Him. His speech in which Jonah is mentioned is recorded by both Matthew and Luke. It is evidently the same speech, for in both Gospels it follows His reply to those who said that He was casting out demons by the power of Beelzebub. The two passages are partly identical, and partly very different. They are as follows:—

MATTHEW xii. 39, 40, 41.	LUKE xi. 29, 30, 32.
An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah the Prophet;	This generation is an evil generation; it seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah;
For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.	For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation.
The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the Judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here.	The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here.

It will be seen that the first and third verses of these two extracts are almost the same, while the second is different in the two; and Luke's report of the speech gives a good meaning, while Matthew's does not: for Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites by his preaching only—if he did rise alive out of the whale's belly, this was *not* a sign to the Ninevites, because they did not see it. It is true that our Lord's resurrection, though not witnessed by the people generally, was so well attested as to be really a sign; but any allusion of the kind would have been out of place in a speech whereof the purpose was to rebuke the craving for a sign.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 24th February, 1889.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—Allow me to back up Mr. Alfred Plummer's letter of 27th ult. He gives a quotation from Cardinal Newman, containing his explanation of the Presence, which might just as well have been written in an unknown tongue for any meaning that can be put upon it by simple-minded people.

I will give the words, and comment as I go on. "Our Lord is *in loco* in heaven, not (in the same sense) in the sacrament." This is very true. Thus the sun is *in loco* in the sky, not, in the same sense, in my room or garden. "He (our Lord) is present in the sacrament only in substance, substantive." What does this mean? Is the sun present in my room or garden in substance? Substantive is brought in for mere effect, and to puzzle plain people. But Newman goes on: "Substance does not require or imply the occupation of place." Of course, if the heat, light, attractive power, etc., of the sun be substances, they do not require or imply the occupation of space. "But," he goes on, "if place is excluded from the idea of the sacramental Presence," it *is* from the idea of a presence by effects, but not from the idea of a presence of a body like ours, a natural body, confined locally to heaven. "Therefore," he goes on, "division or distance from heaven is excluded also, for distance implies a measurable interval, and such there cannot be except between places." This is all the merest truism, not to say twaddle. "Moreover," he adds, "if the idea of distance is excluded, therefore is the idea of motion." This seems a curious abstract position. One would think that motion had very little to do with distance. But there is some reason in all this madness, for he comes to the point. "Our Lord, then, neither descends from heaven upon our altars, nor moves when carried in procession. The visible species change their position, but He does not move." Of course, our Lord does not descend from heaven bodily, as the disciples saw him ascend, nor does He move, as He did into Jerusalem. If His Body does not now descend, what does descend, except the graces, spirit, and virtue from His glorified Body? "The visible species change their position, but He does not move." But, if His Body is present in substance under the species, does not that substance move with the species? Thus the sun gives its light to the moon, and when the light of the moon moves, does not the substance of the moon move also? The whole theory of Newman and Rome is nonsensical. If the Presence is a spiritual Presence of grace, all is plain; it can be everywhere, like the sun's light, etc. But if a *substance* be present, it must be present somewhere *in loco*. Whatever can be in many places at once is not a natural body, such as the 4th Article and the Black Rubric speak of. If Rome is satisfied with Newman's theory, all I can say is that she is easily satisfied. If we have all the benefit which we can have from our Lord's Body while it is *in loco* in heaven alone, I do not see what more we can want. If a spiritual body be one that can confer grace from heaven, and if to be spiritually present means to confer graces, which it can do without the substance of our Lord's Body being present *in loco* anywhere but in heaven, we may all join hands and adopt this reasonable notion of a Real Presence. This kind of presence is one compatible with the bread and wine remaining, after consecration, "these Thy creatures." This is alone compatible with the bread and wine retaining their very natural substances, with the power of strengthening and refreshing our bodies, such as our Lord commands them to be received.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

P.S.—Our terms are often misunderstood. By a Real Presence I merely mean not imaginary; and by objective I only mean not the creation of my own imagination or faith.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

SIR,—"A Member of the Church of Ireland" confesses that there is a Guild, though others had the face to deny it. He says he has seen its rules; but did he see the original ones, which recommended clerical celibacy and habitual private confession? This is the point. He says he likes a Guild; no one objects to a Guild or society of the kind, unless it is intended to teach Romish doctrines, such as masses and offices for the dead, etc. There is no use introducing the names of the Provost or Professors. We have the essays written by Messrs. Morley and Eubank, approved, tacitly at least, by these officers, and published with the University arms and sanction by Messrs. Hodges and Figgis. What these essays teach has been fully exposed, and, until something is said against these Ritualistic doctrines, we must only conclude that such are what the sons of our gentry and our future clergy are to be taught. I fancy we have now heard the last of Mr. "Edmund Lawrence's" "pitiful mare's nest"—and the "myth" theory!

A MEMBER OF THE DUBLIN DIOCESAN SYNOD.
Dublin, February 16th, 1889.
[This discussion must now close.—ED.]

THE LONDON DIOCESAN CONFERENCE.

THIS Conference meets on March 7th and 8th. On the Thursday there will be Holy Communion in the chapel of King's College at 10.30 a.m. The following resolutions will be proposed:—

Canon Capel Cure—"That the laxity of the observance of the Sunday amongst the higher classes has an injurious influence on the religion of the community."

Viscount Halifax—"That, in the opinion of this Conference, there ought to be an early Communion in every church in this diocese on every Lord's day at the very least."

Prebendary Barker—"That it is essential for the present and future efficiency of the Church, and the maintenance of existing Church schools in the metropolis, that some immediate steps be taken to increase the resources of the poorer parishes of the diocese."

The Hon. T. H. W. Pelham—"That while viewing with satisfaction the increased number of clubs and institutes for young men and lads, the Conference is of opinion that much remains to be done in order to counteract the many temptations to gambling and other vicious habits to which the young are exposed, and that the Conference would especially urge the desirableness of giving a prominent place to religious teaching in all such institutions."

The Rev. T. Teignmouth Shore—"That the systematic instruction of the children of the upper and middle classes in Holy Scripture and Church history is of the highest importance; that there is need of special provision for such institutions, and that this Conference respectfully suggests to the Bishop the

desirableness of appointing a small committee to report as to the best means of supplying this need."

Sir W. Phillimore—"That, in the opinion of this Conference, the operation of the law of divorce has been, and is, very injurious to national morality."

The Rev. J. J. Coxhead—"That, in the opinion of this Conference, the evils produced by too early and improvident marriages are such as to cause a necessity for reform in the Marriage Laws."

The Rev. W. M. Sinclair—"That the parish system of the National Church offers the best, most natural, and most constitutional opportunity for the formation of such local voluntary councils as are recommended in the report of the Mansion-house Conference on the condition of the Unemployed, presented in July, 1888; and that by such voluntary parish relief councils as already exist, or may exist, in co-operation (more or less) with more general societies connected with alms-giving, the annual distress in London, normal and abnormal, outside the administration of the Poor Law, may best be met."

The Rev. W. E. Haigh—"That the usual method of conducting funerals in the diocese of London is likely to weaken the influence of the Church in one of the most important and touching of her ministrations."

Mr. P. V. Smith—"(1) That it is desirable that an Act should be passed enabling the Episcopate in both provinces to be from time to time increased, by the machinery of schemes prepared by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and approved by Order in Council, after having been laid on the table of both Houses of Parliament. (2) That it would be desirable that the new county of London should be formed into one diocese and administered by the Bishop of London, assisted by an increased number of Suffragan-Bishops."

The Rev. N. Loraine—"That the subject of lay preaching in church is one of such practical importance as to invite the careful condition of the Conference."

This being the last session of the present Conference, a new Conference will be elected in the course of the next four months.

As already announced, an influential committee, headed by the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, the Archdeacons of Chichester and Lewes, and other prominent Sussex Churchmen, has been formed to invite subscriptions towards a portrait of the venerable Bishop of Chichester. The artist selected is Mr. Ouless; and his work will be placed in the dining-room of the palace, as a heirloom of the see.

ERRATUM.—In our notice of "A Manual for Holy-days" last week, the words "in stereotyped fashion" should read "*un*stereotyped fashion."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Ainslie, Rev. Dr., Vicar of Langport; Surrogate for the Diocese of Bath and Wells.

Almack, Rev. Alfred Corrie, M.A., Vicar of St. Michael's, Bowes, Southgate.

Anderton, Rev. J. T., Rector of Knaresdale; Vicar of Kirkhaugh, Northumberland.

Barnes, Rev. Jocelyn, M.A., Vicar of Breage and Germoe, Cornwall.

Boot, Rev. Alfred, Vicar of St. John's, Darlington; Surrogate.

Burton, Rev. B. C., Curate of St. Matthew's, Widcombe, Bath; Rector of Cherry Burton, Yorkshire.

Cautley, Rev. Proby Littler, M.A., Vicar of Southwold, Suffolk; Rural Dean of Dunwich.

Cogswell, Rev. W. H. L., M.A., Vicar of St. Oswald's, Chester; Chaplain to the Bishop of Chester.

Cother, Rev. J. W. G. I., Rector of Yapton and Vicar of Ford, Sussex.

Cuppage, Rev. Robert Jackson, M.A., Rector of North Barsham, Norfolk.

Dixon, Rev. J. Gilbert, Vicar of St. George's, Birmingham; Vicar of St. Andrew-the-Less, Cambridge.

Edwards, Rev. L. C., M.A., Vicar of Kingsbury, Middlesex; Chaplain of Holy Trinity, Ajaccio, Corsica, for remainder of winter season.

Evans, Rev. Enoch James, M.A., Rector of St. Mary's, Cefn, Denbigh.

Evans, Rev. Professor Owen, M.A., St. David's College, Lampeter; Chaplain to the Bishop of Chester.

Falconer, Rev. John, Curate of St. Peter's, Parr, near Warrington; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Tunstead, Bacup.

Flynn, Rev. Francis, Chaplain to the *Bellerophon*.

Francis, Rev. J. L., Rector of Monk Okehampton; Rector of Bridestowe, Devonshire.

Gore, Ven. Archdeacon, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Chester.

Gray, Rev. A. St. John, Head Master of the King's School, Parramatta; Assistant-Master at Clifton College.

Hewlett, Rev. A. S., A.K.C., Priest-in-Charge of St. Columba's, Salen, Isle of Mull, N.B.

Jackson, Rev. George, B.A., Vicar of Westfield, Sussex.

Leigh, Rev, N. Egerton, Precentor of Leeds Parish Church; Perpetual Curate of Kirkstall, Yorkshire.

Lloyd, Rev. John, Junior Incumbent of St. Paul's, Liverpool.

Low, Rev. Arthur Edward, M.A., Vicar of Legbourne, Lincolnshire.

Marona, Rev. C. A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Portslade-by-Sea.

Moberley, Rev. R. C., Vicar of Great Budworth: Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Chester.

Moore, Rev. John H., A.K.C., Curate-in-Charge of Fewcott, Bicester; Chaplain to the Bicester Union.

Nicolls, Rev. Alexander, Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Duke of Wellington*.

Rooker, Rev. John, jun., M.A., Vicar of Coldharbour, Surrey.

Sclater, Rev. S., B.A., Rector of Westmeston, Sussex.

Spurling, Rev. E. W., M.A., Tutor of Keble College, Oxford; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Chester.

Spurrell, Rev. William George, Bishop's Vicar, otherwise Sub-Dean, in St. David's Cathedral.

Stock, Rev. F. H., Curate-in-Charge of Steventon, Hampshire; Vicar of Kimberworth, Yorkshire.

Tanner, Rev. Charles, Vicar of St. Matthew's, Gosport.

Townley, Rev. Charles Francis, M.A., Rector of Christ Church, Upwell, Isle of Ely.

Tute, Rev. William Andrew, M.A., Vicar of Camrose, Pembrokeshire.

Waters, Rev. W. C., M.A., Curate of Loughton, Essex; Vicar of St. Peter's, Wellington, New Zealand.

Wood, Rev. Canon, M.A., Vicar of Headingley, Leeds; Chaplain to the Bishop of Chester.

Young, Rev. Samuel Martin, M.A., Chaplain of St. Marylebone Infirmary, Notting Hill.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Edwards, Rev. B., at Ashill Rectory, on the 21st ult., within ten days of his 100th year.

Kempe, Rev. George Henry, for forty-three years Rector of Bicton, at Bicton Rectory, S. Devon, on the 20th ult., aged 80.

Lucas, Rev. William Frederick, Senior Curate at Holy Trinity Church, Wordsley, at Wordsley, on the 17th ult., aged 33.

Matthew, Ven. Walter Edmund, Archdeacon of Colombo, on the 19th ult., aged 40.

Self, Rev. W. H., (formerly Vicar of St. John's Lytham), at Les Hirondelles, Torquay, on the 16th ult., aged 84.

Spurgin, Rev. John, B.D., J.P., Vicar of Great and Little Hockham, at Hockham Vicarage, on the 22nd ult., aged 71.

The Church of England Pulpit.

PROPORTION IN CHRISTIAN FAITH AND ACTION.

By the Rev. EDMOND WARRE, D.D., Head Master of Eton College.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday Evening, February 24th, 1889.

"Having therefore gifts differing according to the grace that is given us, whether it be prophesy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith."—Rom. xii. 6.

AT the close of the chapter from which these words are taken, St. Paul sums up its teaching with one brief and pregnant sentence: "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." To the mind of the Apostle, even before he was familiarised by his imprisonment with the sight of the Roman soldiery, their exercises and their panoply, the Christian life presented itself as a warfare—a warfare involving the usual necessities of attack as well as of defence. Be not overcome of evil! The adversaries which war against the soul—that triple alliance of the flesh, the world, and the devil—are ever ready for the assault.

What defence is there against the flesh? "I beseech you," pleads the Apostle, "by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service."

What defence is there against the world? against the constant danger of its false standard, and the corrupting influence of its pleasures and anxieties, its low motives and suggestions of the nearer expediency as the guide of action? "Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed, by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God."

What defence is there against the devil? that evil spirit of self-exaltation and pride, whence, as from a deep source, arise the springs of envy, hatred, and malice, and all uncharitableness. "I say," continues the Apostle, "through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think soberly, according as God has dealt to every man the measure of faith." "Be not overcome of evil." The lines of defence are strongly traced. *The living sacrifice of the body*, presented holy, acceptable to God; *the renewal of the mind*, so that it proves things by reference to God's standard; *humility of spirit.* Where these, by the grace of God, are *maintained* intact, the foe cannot triumph; we shall not be overcome of evil.

This is our first duty. But is it all? To some it has appeared to be so, to the exclusion of every other consideration. Hence have arisen under strong impulses, and mistaken views of the living sacrifice of the body, strange forms of asceticism, unsparing treatment of the body, such as the Apostle glances at in the Epistle to the Colossians, only to condemn. Hence, too—in order to flee from the world and its snares—men have taken refuge in isolation; as, for instance, the silence and the buried life of the Trappist, cut off from the converse and the ways of men. Hence, also, under strange and subtle influences, the voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, which the Apostle speaks of as an intrusion into things unseen, beguiling the soul of its reward; a clutching at shadows, a letting go of its hold upon Christ.

Be not overcome of evil. This is, indeed, our first duty, and accompanies us to the last. But we are not meant to be like a beleaguered city; we are not meant to sit still within intrenchments, awaiting the assault of the enemy. Let us look to our defences. Good! But mere defensive warfare, though sometimes enforced by want of strength, does not often by itself bring peace and security. It does not facilitate supplies; it leaves the great advantage of the initiative to the enemy. No; for the soldier of Christ there is more than this to do. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

There is the *active* service of God. The sphere of action is the field of humanity. The gifts, *differing* according to the grace that is given us; the gifts that we have of God are for use in His service, in active conflict with evil, that we may overcome it with good.

But how? Here is the difficulty. Gifts misused, like weapons turned the wrong way, do harm instead of doing good. The gifts differ, the circumstances in which men are placed differ, tempers differ; infinitely various are men's dispositions and modes of thought. What is to direct and guide the use of gifts in the active service of God? The Apostle prefaces his teaching upon this point with one of his favourite and characteristic similes: "As in one body we have many members, and all members have not the same office, so we being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." The human body is a whole, made up of parts, each one having a different function from the rest, yet they form altogether not a number of discordant fragments, but a harmonious whole. Even so is it with that great body, that society, that fellowship of the faithful, which Christ came into this world to gather into one. The Christian Church is a Body composed of many members, with different offices and gifts, but designed to work together, without

jar or confusion, for a great common end—the manifestation of God's glory and the good of God's creatures.

"Having, then, gifts differing according to the grace that is given us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the *proportion* of faith. This is the key-note of all that follows; this is the point which the Apostle wished to press. "Having each, as Christians, your particular gifts and offices, use them in right proportion." What, then, does he mean by proportion?

Proportion is when things are in their right place; when one object does not unduly attract our attention above another. Look at some of our old churches; why is it that there is in them so much to delight the eye? Why are they so much superior to anything we build now? It is not, very often, because they are richer in detail, or even more beautiful in particular parts, but because the proportion of the whole is so perfect. Nothing is out of its place, nothing is too large or too small, but everything just satisfies the eye.

It is this proportion in the use of Christian gifts, whether it be in Christian preaching or in Christian action, that the Apostle inculcates; whether it be prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith. Prophecy is the gift, not of foretelling events, but rather of preaching, of telling forth the truth of God for instruction of the people. Let this gift, he says, be exercised with due regard to the proportion of the faith, the analogy, the balance, if we may so speak, of the Gospel. Let each part, each side of the truth be brought out in its turn, so that there be no favourite doctrines to the exclusion of others, no favourite views maintained to the neglect of others. Surely an important rule! Christian truth is not of one kind only, but of many. It has its lights and shades, its foregrounds and its distances; it has its lessons of infinitely various significance and importance, some important always, some important only at times, and in reference to particular persons. Woe be to us if, instead of "rightly dividing the word of truth," we confound all its parts together! It is only by following "the *proportion* of faith" that we can rightly understand or act on any part of it. It is possible to believe rightly on every single point; yet, if we take some one favourite point, and give undue prominence to it out of its due proportion, our view of the whole faith suffers, and we are liable to lapse into dangerous error, and our teaching to do harm instead of good. And this rule, I need hardly say, has its application to all of us, and not only to preachers. It is one of which it is hardly possible to exaggerate the importance. For how much are we all prone to forget the right proportion in things spiritual! How much of the present divisions and disputes in the Christian Church is caused simply by the neglect of St. Paul's rule! One set of men exalts ceremonies, and rites, and ritual out of all proportion; another, just as wrongly, disparages and neglects rites and ceremonies altogether. One party makes preaching everything, and puts sacraments in the background; another despises preaching, and says the sacraments are everything. Surely, my brethren, there is nothing of such moment as regards our views of Christian truth, as to observe the due proportion of the faith to seek earnestly from God to understand aright, in all its several parts, and in its complete whole, that Gospel of salvation which has been delivered to us.

And if the right use of gifts in teaching is governed by the rule of proportion, no less so in Christian action. Herein to overcome evil with good, the gifts of grace, the weapons of the Christian soldier, must be used aright. The Apostle mentions several particulars: ministering, that is distribution of alms to the poor; teaching, exhorting, giving; showing mercy—all these examples occurring to him in illustration of his meaning. In all our actions there should be due proportion; and that in two respects: first, we are to keep our own place, to use our own gift, and to attend the duties of our special calling—"if ministry, let us wait on our ministry, or he that teacheth on teaching, or he that exhorteth on exhortation."

Proportion in Christian action is observed when each one does what befits him in his circumstances in his place. So every member of the Christian Church will rightly perform his appointed part in the great whole; and so all the building made up of living stones, like this great cathedral made of many stones fitly joined together, will grow into a holy temple of the Lord.

Once more, in order that proportion in Christian action may be observed, things must be done in the right way, in the right time and place. How often is that which is harmless and good in itself made harmful when done out of season. And how important it is that things should be done in the right way. There is a right and a wrong way, St. Paul shows, of doing good, even good things. A man may give, that is good; but if he gives to get credit for himself, he does the good thing the wrong way; to make the right proportion, he must give with simplicity, *i.e.*, with singleness of aim and a pure motive. So also a man may show mercy; but how easy to show it in a way that shall be no mercy; let it be, says St. Paul, with cheerfulness. How often is the good of an action lost by the ungracious way in which it is done. The secret of all influence, the secret of being beloved, is to mind the way in which we act towards others. Give and show kindness with cheerfulness, in a gracious manner, and with a friendly look, and the act does twice as much good as if it were done churlishly and grudgingly.

My brethren, let no one think this principle unimportant, even in the small things of life. If we would not be overcome of evil, we must keep up our defences by the grace of God within, by

self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control. If we would overcome evil with good, if, in our daily intercourse with our fellow-men, we would advance the cause of good, and diminish the dominion of evil, we must use the gifts we have in accordance with the rule of proportion, which is the rule of Charity, that essential loving spirit, without which all our doings are nothing worth. Each has his own gift, his time, his opportunities of doing good unto all men, especially unto those which are of the household of faith. And if there be truth in the proverb that "Charity begins at home," most of us will find in his own home, in his own domestic circle, manifold opportunities for the exercise of the gifts committed to him. All of us will find in the daily round and common tasks of life an ample field for overcoming evil with good. To do this with watchfulness and prayerfulness, with loving-kindness and with simplicity, is the noble warfare of the soldier of Christ, who, while he is consciously striving for good and against evil, is in good truth the happy warrior, full of joy and comfort, going from strength to strength, ever mindful of the promise of the Great Captain of our salvation: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."

RELIGION AND SOCIAL ENJOYMENTS.

By the Rev. W. KERR-SMITH, M.A.

Sermon Preached in Emmanuel Church, Leeds, on the Second Sunday after Epiphany, 1889.

"Jesus saith unto them, Fill the water-pots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. And He saith unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast."—St. John ii. 7-8.

THE follower of Christ is often confronted with a problem which presses for a solution. It is this: How is he to act with regard to invitations to participate in social enjoyments of a distinctly festive character? Is it an essential condition of Christian membership that he should abjure all gatherings of a convivial sort, and give himself up for the rest of his life to prayer, retirement, fasting, and rigorous self-imposed acts of mortification and denial?

There are those who would have us believe that this must be so; that to be a Christian it is necessary to give up every social enjoyment which is not connected with religion in some way or another. You must never go to a theatre. Dances must be given up. Large parties must be avoided. Novels of all kinds must be kept at a distance. It is wrong to smoke. It is almost a sin to laugh. All one's pleasures must be of a nature supra-sensual, far and away removed from the things of sense and of time. They are to be of an entirely spiritual character, and are to be derived from the contemplation of celestial things, and celestial things alone. The joys of earth are no joys, in any real and lasting sense. The happiness, the delight of the Christian is to be only derived from a spiritual insight into heavenly things.

This is the ascetic view. From the earliest ages there have been those who have taught doctrines such as these. In St. Paul's time the Essene Gnostics of the district about Colossæ held as one of their popular maxims this short rule, "Handle not, taste not, nor even touch;" it was the duty, they believed, of every philosophic Christian mind to abstract itself, as far as possible, from all earthly matters, and live in the atmosphere of heaven. So through all the Church's history we read of hermits, and monks, and Puritans who have believed, oddly enough, that the one only way to please God, and to do His work in the world, is to keep as far away from the world as possible, and to have nothing whatever to do with it.

There are others who go to precisely the opposite extreme. "All things are lawful," say they, quoting St. Paul thus far, "to those that have faith in Christ. If only we are believers in Him, we may indulge ourselves to our heart's content. Those things which are sin to others, are no longer sin to believers. The grace of God is sufficient. The elect are safe."

This doctrine, like the former, has been held from the time of St. Paul onward, "What shall we say, then," writes he to the would-be Antinomians at Rome, "shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" And again, writing to the young bishop of the more wealthy society of the Christian converts in Ephesus, he apprises him of what will befall in the latter days. Unbridled licence is to be fostered in the name and under the guise of Religion. "This know, also, that in the last days perilous times shall come; for men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous . . . . . heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness." This is the logical development of the teaching of those who deny, from whatever cause, that the moral law is any longer binding on Christians; that the Church, being entirely a spiritual body, its members can be safely left to the inspired promptings of their own heart.

Now, when we come to look into our Bibles, especially into those portions of the New Testament which contain a record of the sayings and doings of Jesus, we find out that neither view is correct. The religion of the Christ is neither Ascetic nor Antinomian.

But there is no error which does not contain some grain of truth; and while it is certain that, on the one hand, Christians are not to be allowed an unbridled licence to rush into whatever excesses their nature prompts them to commit, it is equally true on the other that they are not to so fence themselves around with rigid rules, and strict, unbending lines of conduct that they can-

not move hand or foot unless their self-imposed laws give them the required permission. The disciple of Christ is not to be a creature of impulse. The freedman of the Gospel is not to make himself a slave of law. He is essentially a man of principle.

The miracle at Cana of Galilee, and the words of our Saviour upon that occasion, especially those of my text, furnish us with a principle, which we may confidently apply in all cases where a difficulty arises as to what line of conduct we should adopt.

The facts of the story narrated in the early verses of this chapter are well known. The main incident of the narrative is, however, I venture to think, so generally misunderstood that I shall endeavour, before I go on, to give you, as vividly as I can, an account of what actually took place at the conversion of the water.

I suppose the idea most commonly prevalent is that our Lord changed into wine the water in every one of the five or six ewers which stood at the entrance door of the bridegroom's house, placed there for the convenience of the guests, who, as they arrived, would purify themselves from the stains of travel.

The Jews were very particular about this, and, indeed, it was a necessary and wholesome practice. "As they used no knives and forks in eating, it was absolutely necessary that the hand which was thrust into the common dish should be scrupulously clean; and again, as sandals were ineffectual against the dust and heat of an Eastern climate, washing the feet on entering a house was an act both of respect to the company and of refreshment to the traveller."

The duty of washing the feet was allotted to the lowest menial of the household, as being the humblest and lowliest occupation possible. Hence the force of the Saviour's act recorded in thirteenth chapter of this Gospel. It would seem, moreover, that the indignity of washing another's feet attached in a measure to the vessels employed for the purpose. You will remember the contemptuous reference in the sixtieth Psalm to Israel's hereditary foe, "Moab is my wash-pot." I should infer, therefore, that no one would for a moment regard it as possible that the contents of these pots would be drawn for drinking purposes, no more so, indeed, than guests at the present day would expect to be offered water from wash-hand jugs and basons.

On the present occasion, as it was what we should term a big wedding, there was an unusual number of these wash-pots. They had probably been borrowed of the neighbours for this temporary purpose, and were of the largest size. By the side of them would be the basons, towels, and all the necessary appliances for the washing. When we first hear of them they are almost empty. They had not been refilled since the guests had used them for the purposes of purification. The gathering was unusually large. It has not unreasonably been inferred that the consumption of all the wine which the bridegroom had provided before the conclusion of the feast may have been due to an unexpected increase in the number of guests, caused by the arrival of Jesus with His disciples from Judea just before the wedding. "The mother of our Lord, from one reason or another, did not account it unseemly to interfere with, and in some sort to guide the festal arrangements. Perhaps she was near of kin to the bridegroom, or the bride; at all events, she was distressed at the embarrassments of the household, and would willingly have removed them." She calls the attention of her Son to the deficiency. Our Lord, before He proceeds by working the miracle here recorded to supply the want, orders the wash-pots to be filled. Now it is calculated that each one would hold something between eighteen and twenty-five gallons, we may take it that altogether they would contain, when full, about one hundred and thirty gallons. Did He, having commanded them to be filled, turn that water into wine?

I think if you look carefully at the wording of the narrative you will see that this was probably not the case.

Try and imagine exactly what would happen when our Lord told the servants to fill the pots. They would not, of course, carry the huge jars to the well. With smaller vessels which they could (like the woman of Samaria, of whom we read in the fourth chapter) carry in their hands, or on their heads, they would run to the fountain and pour from these into the larger vessels until they were all full.

The first command of our Lord has been obeyed. The wash-pots are filled to the brim. The servants are standing with the small jugs in their hands awaiting His further commands. "Draw out *now*," He says, "and bear—not to the wash-pots—but to the Governor of the feast."

I want you to observe particularly that the words here translated, "Draw out," are only used once more in the New Testament in the account of the drawing of water from the well by the woman of Samaria; and it is further remarkable that the word employed to denote the vessel used by the woman for her purpose, and which would almost seem to have a technical force (αντλημα) as appropriated to vessels used for this particular purpose (perhaps as having some special form of handles for lowering into the well), is coined from the verb, which is here translated "Draw out." If I am right then in my interpretation of it, the command of our Lord could have had but the one meaning. "Draw now *from the well* and carry that which you draw to the Governor."

The command is obeyed. The vessels are once more lowered into the water and borne to the ruler of the feast. And lo! it is no longer water but wine, and better wine than that which they had

been previously drinking. I think, too, that we have a confirmation of this reading of the passage in the comment of the evangelist, that only the servants which drew the water knew whence it came. Had it been baled out from the wash-pots which would stand in full view of the guests, it would have excited not only their astonishment, but, I think, as coming from such a source, their serious indignation.

Now comes the important question, "Why then did our Lord command that these jars of purification should first be filled?" I take it that in the right understanding of this lies the central teaching of the incident.

Consider for what purpose these jars were placed. "St. John is careful to inform us that they are set there" after the "manner of the purifying of the Jews," for the purpose which I have already tried to explain. And you must remember that to the Jew the washing had not only a sanitary but a symbolical purpose. The reason then why our Lord was so careful to insist upon their being filled would seem to be this.

He was about to contribute to the enjoyment of the marriage guests by providing them with more wine. But before He does this He would show by an unmistakeable sign,—an Object-Lesson which would remain indelibly impressed upon the mind of all who witnessed it,—that He can give no countenance to festivity which is not associated with purity; not merely outward purity, but that purity of which this outward washing was but a symbol and a sign. Our Lord used this as He used other of their ceremonies, as for instance the pouring out of the water drawn from the pool of Siloam on the last great day of the feast of Tabernacles, and the lighting of the great candelabra in Temple court, to instruct them in the higher truths of the doctrines which He taught. So had He used the Jewish rite of Baptism, dignifying the rite by associating it with the fundamental truth of a new birth by the Spirit. And you will observe that His habit was so to teach by object-lessons, taking advantage of the objects around Him, or of the circumstances of the moment to illustrate the doctrines which His Father had commissioned Him to preach. Thus it was that His discourse on the Lord's Supper in the 6th chapter of the Gospel was based on the incident which immediately preceded it, the feeding of the 5,000 with five loaves and two small fishes. And again His parable of the sower was probably suggested by the sight of the sower himself scattering the seeds upon the land which lay around the shores of the Sea of Galilee.

On this occasion the water-pots set for the ceremony of purification afforded Him the means of teaching, by the aid of a vivid and very apt illustration.

I think, then, that we have afforded us here a rule of conduct which we may apply to every case where the question arises, "Will it be right for me to do this? Ought I, as a servant of Christ, to be found in such and such a place? Will it be sinful for me to indulge myself in such and such a way?" And the rule is this. We must be careful not to mix in any social festive enjoyment, or participate in that kind of pleasure in which, or associated with which, there is any taint or soil of impurity. And you may add this also: "Never join in anything in which Jesus would not willingly join if He were present"; to which, in fact, like the bridegroom of Cana, you feel you would not like to invite Him as one of the guests. Certainly, He will will not spoil the fun if your jars of purification first of all be filled to the brim.

Depend upon it that if our thoughts and intentions are pure, Christ will be there. He was not only present at the marriage festivities, but he actually contributed to the enjoyment of the guests by increasing the supply of wine.

> Rel gion never was designed
> To make our pleasures less.

Now we all know that there are those who seem to be unable to dissociate pleasure from impurity; who seem to know of no other delights but such as are common to man and beast; who cannot eat without gormandising, drink without being drunken, and who care not to mix with the social circle which does not provide them with a field for the display of lascivious inclinations.

There is no excuse, no palliation for such. The incident in no sense applies to their case. The marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, which our Lord adorned and beautified with His presence, has nothing in common with gatherings where such is allowed and encouraged. But it does teach us that Christ never intended His people to abstain from every form of social pleasure, and physical enjoyment. It does teach us that He is ever ready to assist in turning the cold water of toil and trouble into the good wine of healthy and hearty enjoyment. But first we must see that our water-pots are filled—filled even up to the brim.

I know that there are still those, the modern counterpart of the sanctimonious Pharisee, who accused the Son of Man of being a wine-bibber and a glutton—still those who would deny any such relaxation to a professed disciple of Christ. And there is a sort of fascination in the example and dogmatic assertions of those who are, at any rate, professing to live a higher life of denial than that of their friends and neighbours. But it does not, by any means follow that the assumption of a character for purity implies that the life itself is really pure. We know that the lives of those Pharisees of whom I have just spoken, in spite of their fastings and mortifications, and long extempore prayers, could not compare, in point of purity, with that of Him whom they sneeringly stigmatised "wine-bibber and glutton." We need not, therefore, take much

notice of the objections of those who would have us forego every gratification of this sort.

We are answerable to God, and to Him alone. And if we are satisfied that the thoughts and intentions of our mind are pure, and that the object of our desires is pure also, and that we would do the same were Christ Himself with us, then let such cavillers say what they will; it shall be our lot, as it was His, to mingle with and purify the daily life of man: to "bear a resolute and consistent witness against that indolent and cowardly readiness to give up to the devil, or to the world, aught which, in itself innocent, is capable of being drawn up into the higher world of holiness, even as under other conditions it is in danger of sinking down and coming under the law of the flesh and the world."

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

First Sunday in Lent.

From our earliest days doubtless we have been led by the public opinion of our little world to admire heroism—the heroism of self-denial most of all. A virtue which may well enlist all our admiration, our envy, for who does not know how difficult it is to practise? We have wondered may be at the marvellous self-abnegation which could lead Abraham to willingly offer up his only son, the long waited-for answer to his prayers. We have looked on the great patriotism of an Esther, who sinking self in the love of country could go, with her life in her hand, to plead with an Eastern despot for her people. We have seen a Paul give up all that a man of his mental calibre, his social position, holds dear, that he might join the minority to fight for truth against error, for right against wrong—and to come to our own day, who does not rejoice to think of such noble souls as Grace Darling, Bishop Patteson, General Gordon? And yet, great as are all these, they are, after all, but reflections. Without the great example which Lent recalls to our mind, they could never have been. For were not even the Old Testament heroes inspired by the fact that they were the chosen men? Were they not helped by the purity of their faith? Before the self-sacrifice of the Son of God all other efforts seem but small. "For our sakes" who were His enemies; "for our sakes" who rejected all His overtures; "for our sakes" who often now will not listen to His voice; He suffered all the loss of the splendour and dignity of heaven; He endured the daily contact with sin; He bore all the privations and pains that flesh is heir to; He underwent the withdrawal of His Father's love. Do we realise all this? If we did, could we be so lukewarm, so careless? Should we ever forgive ourselves if we treated an *earthly* friend with such ingratitude? Thank God we may amend! We will endeavour by His help to tread more in the footsteps of our Lord. We will try to deny ourselves in all reality—not the mere giving up for a few weeks of some little luxury; but the steady, God-given, earnest, determination to fight in ourselves the demon of self. To learn from our Saviour to seek more the honour of God, the triumph of right, the final conquest of sin.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly
CURED
by simply using the
AMMONIAPHONE
FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.
21s. post free.
WILL LAST FOR YEARS.
Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials may be had FREE OF CHARGE on application to Medical Battery Co. Ltd.
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 9, 1889.

OBJECT-LESSONS FROM HAWARDEN.

In Mr. Gladstone's famous speech upon the introduction of the Land Act of 1881, he made the historic statement that the Irish landlords had been placed upon their trial and had been acquitted. That was his general verdict upon the Irish Land Question, from the full and fair survey of the whole facts of the discussion. From that day to this Mr. Gladstone has never withdrawn that final verdict. His own allies, the Parnellites, have no doubt wondered over and over again why their chief, who could swallow so many of his old-time statements, still kept to this one, so important to the issue and so galling to his own party. At last a glimmer of light is upon the situation. "Conscience doth make cowards of us all"; and it may only be that Mr. Gladstone's own knowledge of the management of his own property made him understand that after all it was better to acquit the Irish landlords of any concerted and general inhumanity upon their tenantry. Recently the country was startled by the reports which appeared in the *Liverpool Courier*, giving the facts of a number of evictions which had been carried out, not in the wilds of Donegal, or the bogs of Clare, the glens of Wicklow, but on the Flintshire estate of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. One would have certainly thought that after all Mr. Gladstone's sympathy for the tenants of Ireland, after all the legislation in regard to the land of which he has been the main-spring and motive power, his own estate would be governed on all the principles of justice, humanity and mutuality which, he alleges, have distinguished his frequent incursions upon the estates of his brother landlords

(shall we say grabbers?) in the sister island. It may be so; but the facts show that the Gladstone property is worked on the ordinary "pay and go" principles which have produced all the mock heroics and stage indignation of the Lefevres, the Morleys, the Dillons and O'Briens of the present day. Take the case of the Widow Whitehead, who has been evicted from her holding on the Gladstone property. She held a small farm of ten acres, for which she paid the exorbitant rent of £25, the land lying low and being often flooded. Her husband died a year ago, and her son six months ago, and for these reasons she remained in arrears. There being no plan of campaign to join, Mrs. Whitehead sold up all her stock on distraint, and paid every farthing to the Gladstone treasury. Being particularly anxious to stay in the house she offered £8 a year rent for it, but the "rapacious" landlord—as he would infallibly be called in Ireland—wanted £10, and what was much more to the purpose, had a "land grabber" handy who was willing to give it, and so poor Widow Whitehead was forced to go, turned out without the chance of being re-admitted as a caretaker, as would infallibly be the case in Ireland. Mr. Speed is another "victim of landlord tyranny in Wales," as no doubt Mr. Davitt will stigmatise Mr. Gladstone's proceedings when he gets a chance. He occupied a miserable dwelling, stated to be almost unfit for human habitation, together with twelve acres of land, at a rent of £26 a year. From poverty and heavy sickness, engendered, as is alleged, by the insanitary character of the dwelling-house, Mr. Speed fell into arrear with his rent, and Mr. Gladstone has put in the bailiffs, and the tenant will be sold up. No compensation has, it is said, been given for improvements, although the tenant has devoted his labour for years to the improvement of the land and paid his predecessor £11 for hay and £5 for manure, while during the whole of his tenancy the landlord spent nothing on the holding. The case of Mr. Hughes is even more touching. The farm from which he has been evicted had, like so many in Ireland, been in the possession of his family for two hundred years. For forty-nine acres Hughes paid £76 a year. He claims to have made permanent improvements and have put his labour into the land without a penny compensation. He has met heavy losses through the agricultural depression, but the landlord has not spent anything on the farm for years, and now enforces his rights in the usual manner, which, if carried out in Ireland, would infallibly be denounced by Mr. Gladstone's own allies as cruel and despotic Now we are far from denying that all these evictions may be inevitable and necessary, but if so the least we may demand is that the same publicity be given to English as to Irish evictions, especially when they occur on the property of one of the chief orators of the anti-eviction campaign. It should be noticed that there was no boiling water or scalding meal employed in defending these homes of the Hawarden peasantry. There were no barricades; the Widow Whitehead threw no vitriol at the auctioneers sent by the Grand Old Man's son and agent; the service of the police even was dispensed with; not a single member of Parliament was present; no parish priest came to incite the populace to deeds of daring patriotism which necessitated violation of the law. Everything, in fact, was carried out in a plain English matter-of-fact kind of way. Mr. Gladstone, we make no doubt, is very sorry, as are Irish landlords, when their tenants cannot or will not meet their obligations, but his sorrow has no effect upon his action. This is a matter of business between man and man, and there can be no sentimental considerations allowed to intervene between the law and the operations thereof. It is only when tenants in Ireland refuse to pay rent on principle that English statesmen mount the rostrum and bellow out platitudes about permitting agriculturists to "live and thrive," and the necessity of passing Arrears Bills and Tenants' Improvements Bills, and Bills for rooting the occupiers in the soil. These Hawarden evictions are illustrations of the hideous hypocrisy of Parnellism and Gladstonism. Mr. Dillon's one panacea for Ireland is to prevent the sale or the letting of land from which a tenant has been evicted for non-payment of rent. He is going to Australia in order to collect funds to carry out his plan of campaign in furtherance of his policy. Why does he not go down to the Hawarden estate and preach the same policy in favour of the evicted tenantry of his ally the leader of the Opposition? There he will find the "land grabbers," as he will call them, eagerly coming forward to avail themselves of the opportunity to take land which has become vacant owing to the poverty of the tenant. Let Mr. Dillon set to work to carry out his plan of campaign in Flintshire, and then let us see what English public opinion will say upon his action. When the British public begin to wake up, and compare the vast privileges which Irish tenants have as compared with Mr. Gladstone's, the first step will have been taken in the task of enlightenment on the Irish Land Question. Public attention at present is concentrated largely on Gweedore and Father M'Fadden. That reverend gentleman was the tenant himself of two small holdings at Gweedore. For the first he paid a rent of 6s. 8d. a-year, and the tenant-right sold for £83; for the second the rent was 22s. 6d., and the tenant-right sole for £115. Contrast such favourable terms for a tenant leaving his land with the lot of Mr. Gladstone's tenants, who declare that they received not one penny on leaving their holdings. If the same rule held good, Mrs. Whitehead and Messrs. Speed and Hughes would never have been turned out by the Gladstonian evictor. These

Hawarden evictions are the best object-lesson possible for all students of the Irish question, and will serve as an excellent answer to the universal nonsense talked on Parnellite platforms by Gladstonian orators.

RELIGIOUS ANIMOSITY.

By W. WALTERS, Esq., B.A., London.

(*Continued from page* 105.)

It is nothing new that two widely differing parties should exist within the Church; ever since the Reformation such has been the case, and almost from the day that a separation was made between Rome and ourselves, there have been those who strove to heal the breach. And where union with the old Church has never been contemplated, there has ever been a considerable school which connected the reception of divine grace more closely with outward ordinances than numbers would now do. Let any one but note the writings of the reformers themselves he will find that their sacramental views were by no means so limited as those of modern days to the symbolical value and benefit of baptism and the supper. The words of the Church Catechism, strong as they seem to many, who even would urge their removal from the Prayer Book, are not a whit more expressive than those used by the founders of the Reformed Church. And, indeed, it is a question whether the Catechism of the Westminster divines itself is not more churchlike than many evangelical teachers of the present day confess themselves to be, and whether its sacramental teaching would not, by extreme men, ignorant of its source, be pronounced to be tainted with ritualistic error.

Those who are apprehensive of danger to the Church from the existence within its bosom of two parties opposed on points of what they deem vital importance, may, perhaps, take comfort from the reflection that other questions, seemingly as important, have divided the Church, but whilst they have sunk into insignificance, the Church itself has survived and flourished. To say nothing of the numerous feuds on what seem to us minor points of doctrine, which in earlier ages tore the Church asunder, let any one reflect upon the bitterness with which the questions of Calvinism and Arminianism were debated, and this down to quite recent years. Let people who dread that the present crisis may prove more trying and destructive than those which have gone before take comfort from the promise, which especially regards the united Church, "As thy days so shall thy strength be." Let it be remembered that show and elaborate ritual have here chiefly the attraction of novelty; that they have been tried in other times and in other countries and found wanting, even in the power to draw the mulitude of the sight-seeing and the careless.

There is often reason to fear that in this as in former controversies there is more party zeal and spiteful dislike to an opponent than real desire to advance the cause of truth and of God. No one can be blameless, no one an imitator of the Master, who uses harsh words, attributes bad motives to others, or descends so low as to employ scurrilous names to his opponents and to their principles. When we hear the expressions "Puseyite," "Romish," "Jesuitical," or "Erastian," and "Puritanical," employed as epithets of disparagement, we may question whether much love of God and man is there. It is the duty of every one to speak of those who differ from him as he would like them to speak of him. Though he may not approve of their reasoning or of their practices, let him give credit for upright intentions, and let him believe that where there exists a desire to serve God faithfully, as far as knowledge permits, such aspiration will probably be accepted by the Almighty, and certainly deserves to be respected by a fellow mortal. Those who would feel injured by having themselves spoken of as Soupers, Swaddlers and heretics by wrathful Irish priests, should be as far as possible from imitating, even in the least degree, so vile an example. How much evil has been done by weak and unscrupulous advocacy. There are many who have faith in the benefit of controversial lectures, political agitation, denunciation of priestly oppression and immorality, circulation of extracts from questionable writers, and all the other weapons of the kind which find favour in election contests. It is doubtful whether any permanent good is in this way effected. Even if converts can be proved to have been in this way brought in, it is more than probable that the minds of the majority have been thereby turned further from union and from the wish to improve.

With the heathen or the avowed unbeliever the course might be somewhat of an aggressive one, always supposing that charity, consideration for the feelings of others, allowance for their ignorance, and thorough appreciation of our own weakness and limited knowledge are suffered to prevail in our minds. But with any one who, in real sincerity, acknowledges himself to be the servant of one Master, Christ, who believes all the great articles of faith equally with us, who expects to be judged by the same King as do we ourselves, our course should be as gentle as truth allows. If men were thoroughly possessed with the idea that every living person on whom the name of Christ is named, and to whom the knowledge of his Saviour has been made known, constitutes a part of his visible Church, and is at least called to glory and has at least a chance of the society of the redeemed and of the enjoyment of the presence of his Lord, would it be possible for us in thought to shut others out of the kingdom of heaven, and to treat as implacable enemies those with whom we may have to associate as members of the great Church triumphant? The heart of God is more full of beneficence than the narrow thought of man; and whilst we may be certain that no sin shall go unpunished, and whilst we may reasonably fear that the consequences of sin may be eternal, let nothing ever induce us to say that even corrupt belief shall of itself exclude from the kingdom, however much it may mar the crown and lessen the glory.

Church order and government, the age at which Baptism should be received and the mode of its administration, are questions chiefly vested upon traditional or inferential grounds. Churchmen hold that there is a *regula fidei*, and that when this is broken a religious community declines, but though they lament that fellow Christians refuse to acknowledge the tradition or accept the inference they cannot well do more. Individual salvation is not dependent upon ecclesiastical theories. The most particular Baptist would scarcely say, that no true Church existed for some eleven centuries, nor does a strict churchman

honestly think that the many saintly persons which have lived and died Nonconformists have no part in the kingdom of God.

There are numbers of good men who, while they are willing to allow all that may be said as to the exhibition of charity and consideration towards differing religious views, yet think that in a public capacity and in the interests of the Church itself, they are bound to take another course when men of their own pale are concerned. Viewing those of the Catholic party as lawbreakers, they have united for the purpose of discovering the precise limits of the law, and of vindicating its character so far as might be.

Are they right in so doing, or is the other side justified in calling such attempts at legal action persecution? Now let us examine what persecution really is, when applied to cases of such a nature. Laws exist which were made to uphold a particular form of religious belief and practice, and which by consequence threaten with penalties, more or less severe, all deviations from the standard. A certain new belief or new interpretation of doctrine arises, which is thought to be dangerous to the established faith; the laws are then called into action to repress the innovation. Now setting aside all violent means whatever, and unauthorised attacks of mobs or individuals, the various persecutions, whether by Catholic against Protestant, or heathen against both, amounts to nothing more than this; and the action taken by late combinations of churchmen amounts to nothing less. In each instance there is the same aim and mode of procedure; that is to say, the calling in of the civil power to repress a system—some movement thought to be dangerous to the established order of things.

But then, say Protestant churchmen, we have to deal with those who are teaching doctrines other than those to which they once pledged themselves. If this be the case, such innovators are only in the position of all men who seek to alter an established system. The reformers everywhere were men who had made most solemn pledges to be faithful to the old Catholic system. Calvin, Luther, and the compilers of the Prayer Book all set aside the authority to which they had promised implicit obedience. The leaders of the advanced school deny, however, that they are violating any lawful orders. Their plea is that only the Church has power to legislate for the Church. Inasmuch as it would have been most improper for Ambrose and the Church of his day to have submitted details of ecclesiastical discipline, faith or worship to the then Emperor, equally improper is it now to allow that a secular government, composed of persons of any or of no religion, can have the least right to regulate the affairs of the Church of Christ. They urge that radical changes were again and again made at the instance of princes and nobles, whereby continuity of Church order was broken, opinions introduced foreign to the early ages and to all immediately preceding ones. They say that, though the Church may have been forced into an unwilling submission by the strength of the civil power, yet since no length of time can ever render that true which was not so originally, they feel themselves justified in striving by all possible means to restore what they deem to be the true order and belief of the English Church, which had been by unrighteous means thrust aside and banished from the land three centuries previously.

Their plea is that the real Articles of the Anglican Church are not a thirty-nine or a forty-two that a mixed assembly of clerics, peers, foreign agitators and others may have agreed upon in private, under the inspection of a prince and at his bidding. They assert that the general belief of the Holy Catholic Church throughout all the world, from the age of the Apostles, is the only standard that they can accept. To act in conformity with the rules of the Church of all time is with them to keep the law, whatever Acts of Parliament, custom of three centuries, or popular opinion may say to the contrary. Can it be thought strange if those who entertain such views should look upon the various legal processes against them as so many instances of persecution, and themselves as a sort of martyr in a holy cause? If you say that the object of legal trials is only to ascertain the state of the law, they reply that the only true law for them was ascertained ages ago, and that as for modern legislation it has no weight with them—that it is so confused and conflicting that it is next to an impossibility to get at the drift of it—and that where it can be unriddled the advantage is on their side.

(*To be continued.*)

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." March, 1889. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

WE gladly welcome another paper by Professor Milligan, on the Priesthood and Priestly Service of the Church. "How far," he begins by asking, "is [Christ's] Church on earth priestly? and, if she is so, what are the functions in which her priestliness is fulfilled?" It would be absurd to try and summarise Professor Milligan's arguments, but we must find space for his concluding words: "At this moment nothing is more imperatively demanded of the Church than a revival of that idea of her priestliness which flows directly from the fact that she lives in Him who is our High Priest in heaven. The idea has been left too long associated with periods of unscriptural domination on the part of the clergy, and of ignorance and superstition on the part of the laity. In spite of this, it is alike true and fundamental. A clear perception and a bold enunciation of the Church's priestly character lies at the very root of all that is most distinctive, most real, most forcible, and most valuable in her work. The duty of the Church is not to abandon a position to which she has been divinely called, because it has been abused and may be abused again. It is rather so to occupy it that the fears of timorous friends may be dispelled, and the reproaches of opponents silenced. The aim of true priesthood is not wealth, or station, or power. It is love, work, self-sacrifice! The anointing in Bethany was accepted by the Redeemer as His consecration, not to worldly honours, but to His burying; and to such a burying, not to ease in the high places of the earth, is the Church in her turn consecrated. She has not gained much by casting the thought of her priestliness aside. Let her again proclaim it, not so much in word as in deed; and it may be that men will be more ready to listen to her message, and that the house will once more be filled with the odour of the ointment."

Dean Chadwick's paper on St. Peter, though not containing anything very original, is yet so forcibly written, that we read it with pleasure. But Mr. Chase's satire on Vischer's hypothesis in regard to the Apocalypse, is rather too clever. It is an attempt to turn

Vischer's arguments on himself by applying them to 2 Thess. ii. 1-12. Now, ridiculous as Vischer's theory is, it must be remembered it was not his own, but that of a sharp lad in his class, who probably knew how he would best gain favour with his teacher. Mr. Chase's paper is no real reply. It is only a *reductio ad absurdum*—in theology always a two edged weapon; the sublime and the ridiculous, as well as the ridiculous and the ridiculous, being very close one to another.

Dr. Dods praises Archdeacon Farrar's "Lives of the Fathers" as an excellent attempt to popularise the history of the early Church. In that aspect we wish the book every success. Professor Bruce continues his exposition of the Hebrews, and Professor Curtiss writes an account of recent Old Testament literature in the United States.

"THE COMIMG OF THE FRIARS, AND OTHER HISTORIC ESSAYS." By the Rev. A. Jessopp, D.D. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

THE essays in this volume, like those in Dr. Jessopp's preceding volume, "Arcady," are principally reprints from the *Nineteenth Century;* but those who have already read them there will be glad to have them in this convenient and well-printed volume. There are six essays in the volume, in addition to the one which gives its name to the book—not the best, in our opinion, for the fourth and fifth, on the Black Death in East Anglia, are more interesting and fuller of information. Dr. Jessopp's account of that awful calamity—to our thinking all the more awful because there is not the slightest reason to suppose that either it, or some similar scourge, may not again visit our shores, or again, that if it does, modern science could grapple with it—is graphic to a degree almost too high for the tastes of those who do not love to sup on horrors. The Black Death, though it was *not* cholera, could yet, and often did, strike down its victims as quickly and sometimes more quickly than even cholera does. We do not know how this extract will read as an extract, but when we read it in the context its horror seemed to us quite unsurpassed. Dr. Jessopp's principal evidence for the suddenness and virulence of the scourge is the Court Rolls of the Old Manors. "In one instance that I have met with," he writes, "the first half of the entries of the business carried on at one of these courts in the summer of this year (A.D. 1349) is written in the ordinary court hand of the time, and the rest is rudely scrawled by some one whose hand *is not yet formed;* it looks like the writing of a lad apprenticed to the scrivener's business. Was the steward of the manor actually smitten by the plague as he was holding the court, a subordinate taking his place and awkwardly finishing the work which his master's glazed eye perhaps never looked on? Again and again I have found that a series of Court Rolls of an important Norfolk manor is perfect for the first twenty-two years of Edward III., and no record remains for the next year or two. Then they begin once more, and have been preserved with unbroken regularity. At Raynham, in a parish of 1,400 acres, there were three small manors. The courts of one of them were held three times in the year 1348. *Upon the same parchment*, and immediately following the records of the previous year, come some scarcely legible notes of a court held in 1349—precise day of the month omitted—the entries scrawled informally by a scribe who not only did not know the forms of the court, but who was evidently not a professional writer. He bungled so that he seems actually to have given up his task. The next court of the manor was not held held till three years had gone by. At Helloughton, a manor now belonging to the Marquis of Townshend, where two courts were held annually, the series of rolls for the first twenty-two years of Edward III. is complete. Then comes one which scarcely deserves to be called a court roll, so entirely informal is it, and so evidently drawn up by some one who did not know his business, and who did not pretend to know it. It is little more than a collection of rough memoranda of deaths. Twelve of the *suitors* of the court had died without heirs; seven others had come to do fealty to the lord as successors to those whose heirs they presumably were. Nothing else is recorded. At another manor of Lord Townshend's, Raynham Parva, between the years 1347 and 1350, no court seems to have been held, though the lord of the manor, Thomas de Ingaldesthorp, had died in the interval. The scourge of the plague had been so awful in its incidence, that when the next court was held, on the 24th July, 1350, fourteen men and four women, holders of land, be it remembered, are named as having died off, not one of whom had left a living representative behind them. In all cases their little holdings had escheated to the lord. Amongst them was one John Taleour, Clericus. Was he the clerk who up to this time had kept the rolls so neatly, and who could not easily be replaced after he fell a victim to the plague?" To those who know what manor courts were in the olden times this is indisputable evidence how deadly the Black Death was. Yet Dr. Jessopp says, "There is little mention of any panic, few ugly tales of desertion of the dying, no flagrant instances of miserable creatures crying that the wells were poisoned." Would the historian of the next century be able to say the same of us if the Black Death should appear during this? We sadly fear he would not.

Of the effects of the Black Death, Dr. Jessopp writes shortly and clearly, generally agreeing with Bishop Stubbs. The diminution of the clergy, the increase of escheats of the property of lords of manors, the increased value of labour, these are amongst the principal effects Dr. Jessopp enumerates. Yet he warns his readers not to follow merely popular historians who would make the Black Death account for "everything." It was only a link, though an important link, in the chain of change.

The essay called "A Mediæval Monastery" will be full of information and interest to many. Popular Protestantism thinks the monks of old did little else than eat and drink and amuse themselves by writing imaginary lives of saints. Sentimental folk think they spent their whole time in meditation and prayer. Dr. Jessopp can and does tell both better.

From the essay on "The Coming of the Friars," we would make one quotation:—

"Rome has never been afraid of fanaticism. She has always known how to utilise her enthusiasts fired by a new idea. The Church of England has never known how to deal with a man of genius. From Wichlif to Frederick Robertson, from Bishop Peacock to Dr. Rowland Williams, the clergyman who has been in danger of impressing his personality upon Anglicinism, where he has not been the object of relentless persecution, has at least been regarded with timid suspicion, has been shunned by the prudent men of low degree, and by those of high degree has been forgotten. In the Church of England there has never been a time when the enthusiast has not been treated

as a very *unsafe* man. Rome has found a place for the dreamiest mystic or the nosiest ranter—found a place and found a sphere of useful labour. We, with our insular prejudices, have been sticklers for the narrowest uniformity, and yet we have accepted, as a useful addition to the Creed of Christendom, one article which we have only not formulated, because, perhaps, it came to us from a Roman Bishop, the great sage, Talleyrand—*Surtout, pas trop de zèle!*" Very true ; but we would ask Dr. Jessopp : Dare any Roman Ecclesiastic pen such an unfavourable comparison as the above? Hardly, or at any rate not unless he was too high up to be touched. If the Church of England is and ever has been far too "eminently respectable," at least we dare speak the truth about ourselves.

The last essay, "The Prophet of Walnut Tree Yard," is brimful of humour and shrewdness. But all are good, and whether this volume of essays is better or not than "Arcady," we neither know nor care ; we only want yet another volume.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE SIGN OF JONAH THE PROPHET.

SIR,—I should not trouble you with any further discussion regarding the book of Jonah and our Lord's reference to his story, after the admirable letter of "Presbyter" in your issue of March 2, were it not for the letter of Mr. J. J. Murphy which you print next to it.

Mr. Murphy bluntly says : "It appears to me most likely that the words ascribed to our Lord about Jonah in the whale's belly were never spoken by Him." These words, contained in St. Matthew, do not give a good meaning. St. Luke's, which omit them, do, according to Mr. Murphy.

I am sorry that a writer, generally thoughtful and reverential, should think fit to impeach the authority of one of the Gospels on such a slight ground. But, waiving all censure of this rashness, I think I can prove that, so far from St. Luke's being the only satisfactory account of the discourse, St. Matthew's words, thus impeached by Mr. Murphy, are absolutely necessary to complete the sense of the narrative in St. Luke.

The thing to be explained is "the sign of Jonah the Prophet." "Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites." How? By his preaching only, says Mr. Murphy. Can he cite any instance in the Bible of a man's being said to be a sign simply by virtue of his preaching? Was our Lord "a sign" to the men of His own generation by His preaching only?

But, if we take Jonah's inhabitation of the whale and his deliverance from it as the sign afforded to the Ninevites, there is an exact analogy between that and our Lord's inhabitation of the heart of the earth and His resurrection from it : for, observe, Jonah's (deliverance) was not *seen* by the Ninevites ; neither was our Lord's Resurrection *seen* by the Jews. Both facts—the fact in the apologue of Jonah, the fact in the actual history of Christ—would only be known by *report*. *This*, then, is the point in which Jonah and the Son of Man coincide as signs to a wicked generation—the difference being that, in the one case, the sign reported concurred with the preaching in producing general repentance ; whilst, in the other case, the sign, with the great majority of the nation, was useless.

It may be objected that the Ninevites are not said to have heard about the marvellous deliverance of the Prophet. But are "the men of this generation" so utterly destitute of all power of supplying missing links as to suppose that the history does not imply the reporting of such a marvel merely because the transmission of the report is not expressly mentioned?

Certainly this prosaic inaptitude for reading into Oriental narratives their requisite conditions is a barrier against understanding the Old Testament, and may lead, as in this case, to a dangerous tampering with the authority of the New.

C. P. M.

THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

SIR,—I regret with many clergy and laity this pending action against the Bishop of Lincoln ; at the same time no one ought to wonder at the proceeding. I am not a member of the "Church Association," and I only know some of its contributors by name ; but thus much I believe, that they are no "persecutors." If trees are to be judged by fruits, some leading men connected with the Church Association, and others who uphold their action, are foremost in restoring abbeys, building churches (the church erected by one of these gentlemen shows the largest collections on Hospital Sunday), and giving out of their abundance "full measure and running over," to the vital extension of our Church. The bountiful aid to many philanthropic schemes given by many laymen who object to "the conspiracy to Romanise the Church of England" (Bishop Wilberforce in the House of Lords) is "passed by on the other side,' and their action is assailed by a long list of donors to the Bishop of Lincoln's defence, as persecution, or because a bishop can do no wrong, and the Church speaks through him only. Some Church papers, true to their one-sidedness, try to throw dust in their readers' eyes by writing about "this attempt to do away with the *concordat* made at the Reformation ;" or, we are asked to believe that "the compromise in the Church of England is sought to be done away with."

As to this assumption about a "*concordat* at the Reformation," it is simply to misstate the whole question. The Reformation (if the term has any meaning) points to our throwing off the superimposed garments and doctrines of Rome, and being happy in a previously wrong doctrine. The Courts of Law have decided that an outer covering may be worn in cathedrals at the Holy Communion, and the eastward position is distinctly forbidden in Consecration. As to the "compromise in the Church of England," where does it date from, read from the standpoint of the Bishop of Lincoln's defenders? My recollection goes back to a great revival for good in many ways, as the outcome of the "Oxford movement." My first rector was an old-fashioned High Churchman. He and a good many more—who have not changed with more modern times—are now nowhere as to their views of the "concordat" or "compromise."

There is another very serious aspect of the question —I mean from a lay point of view. Lord Carnarvon's late speech in the Lords only showed that very good men may lose their heads, while the Premier kept his head. Lord Carnarvon is not one generally ignorant of public opinion, but in his speech he seemed to see only a possible triumph for "High or Low." Is there no weight to be attached to the opinion of this Lincoln case, held by the risen and rising generation of men? The Ritualist may glory in the whole indictment; he would carefully read the *whole proceedings*. The man of the world will merely read the charges, and form his own idea. Let me put it from the layman's point of view as expressed. A bishop should wait till the law is clear. He is evidently trying it on how much he may do to please his own ideas—that would hardly do in the Navy or Army; and what a bobbery about non-essentials, unless he wants us to sail nearer to the Romans. Would it not be wise for us clergy to try and sometimes look at such cases outside the Church papers? There is no doubt in thoughtful minds that things Romeward are coming to a crisis. As loyal members of our beloved Church—God's founding, the blessed instrument of increasing benefit to our old country—a great many of the clergy, if they dared each to speak out, and a very great majority of laymen, do not advocate prosecution, and are far away in their minds and hearts from persecuting so excellent a Christian man as the Bishop of Lincoln; but what are they to do? Those who are withstanding the Bishop of Lincoln's innovations are "taking the bull by the horns"; others who are up the tree of indifferentism will enjoy the bull "running a muck"; others will go along comforted in the solace, when this fuss is over the row will end: the bull may toss his foe, and then we can rest and be thankful, and all the field will be at peace, because the bull has spent himself. We can deal with bulls off their heads thus; but the Church of England has to deal with John Bull. That awkward animal is a reasoning as well as irate animal. He may ask the reason why a bishop should put himself forward to try the strength of the bull-ring stakes. Whether the bull breaks through the enclosure or not remains to be seen; but John Bull has a born idea of law and order. As sure as Irish M.P.'s think that England may go to ruin for aught they care if only they can have their way—but will not, because they won't have their way —so surely this extreme movement thinks it will have its way, but cannot. The *heart* of this Old England may dally with Rome through her aristocracy, but the *brain* of Old England is not ripe, is not ready to sacrifice on the altar of æstheticism, and will worship all that it values as vital influence in the English nation and English Church. This unhappy case will, or may, promote Disestablishment; but the Church of God in England "established" itself apart from the State, and in some shape or other it will rise from these ashes of miserable controversy to display itself as founded on the rock of Truth, whether Established or Disestablished.

JOHN BULL.

THE Bishop of Glasgow has, says the *British Weekly*, declined to allow Canon Wilberforce to advocate the cause of temperance in the churches in that diocese, and condemns him, as a minister of the Church of England, for co-operating with the Church of Scotland.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baines, Rev. Albert Charles, Rector of Little Rollright, Oxon.
Brown, Rev. R. H., Senior Curate of St. Giles-in-the-Fields; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Lincoln's Inn Fields.
Buckwell, Rev. W. B., M.A., Incumbent of Arkley, Barnet; Rector of Cheriton, Kent.
Cadman, Rev. Canon W., Rector of Holy Trinity, St. Marylebone; Rural Dean of St. Marylebone.
Duff, Rev. Garden Llanoe, Curate of Holy Trinity, Poulton-le-Sands; Incumbent of St. Congan's Turriff, Aberdeenshire.
Francis, Rev. Walter Bernard Kendall, M.A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Cleopatra*.
Hare, Rev. John Church Francis, M.A., Oxon, Rector of Wolferlow, near Worcester.
Harris, Rev. C. E., Chaplain at Weimar.
Harvey, Rev. Alfred J., M.A., late Curate of St. James's, Paddington; Vicar of Shirehampton, Gloucestershire.
Heaslop, Rev. Charles Le P. T., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Conquest*.
Jenkins, Rev. Lewis Daniel, Perpetual Curate of St. Thomas's, Pen-y-cae, Denbighshire.
Jones, Rev. H. D., M.A., Rector of St. John's, Upper St. Leonard's; Rural Dean of Hastings (First Division).
Karney, Rev. Gilbert S., Perpetual Curate of St. John's Chapel, Downshire Hill, N.W.; Vicar of Melton Mowbray.
Kendall, Rev. R. S., Chaplain at St. Malo.
Lewis, Rev. Harvey James, B.A., Assistant-Master in Ripon Grammar-school; Licensed to Preach in the Diocese of Ripon.
Lindesay, Rev. W. O'Neill, M.A., Curate of Donaghcloney (Waringstown); Incumbent of Baronscourt, Newtown.
Locke, Rev. C. J. H., Rector of Lufton; Local Secretary for the Additional Curates' Society for the Deanery of Ilchester with Martock Division.
Ryle, Rev. Herbert, Hulsean Professor of Divinity at Cambridge; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon.
Sandford, Right Rev. Daniel Fox, LL.D., Lord Bishop of Tasmania; Rector of Boldon, Gateshead, and Coadjutor to the Bishop of Durham.
Sims, Rev. Frederick Arthur, B.A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Emerald*.
Stubbs, Rev. D. H., Curate of Prescot, Liverpool; Vicar of Penwortham, Preston.
Thoyts, Rev. E., M.A., Priest-in-Charge of Tain, Diocese of Ross, and sometime Canon of Inverness Cathedral; Rector of Ashe, Hants.
Vaughan, Rev. Ernest John, M.A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Constance*.
Venables, Rev. Edward, M.A., Vicar of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Drury Lane; Rector of Christ Church, Marylebone.
Waters, Rev. W. C., M.A., Curate of Loughton; Vicar of St. Peter's, Wellington, New Zealand.
Watson, Rev. E., Vicar of Ebernoe, Sussex.
West, Rev. J. M., Metropolitan Secretary Church Missionary Society; Vicar of Hazlemere, Bucks.
Young, Rev. S. M., M.A., Chaplain to St. Marylebone Infirmary, Notting Hill.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bull, Rev. Henry John, Rector of Roborough, on the 28th ult., aged 70.
Childs, Rev. Henry Horatio, Vicar of Shippon, Abingdon, on the 26th ult., aged 52 years.
Moullin, Rev. D. A., for forty years Rector of Holy Trinity, Newington, at Trinity Rectory, Merrick Square, on the 28th ult.
Patey, Rev. Thomas Maurice, at Hampreston Rectory, on the 3rd inst., aged 67.
Pearse, Rev. Henry, for fifty-four years Rector of the Parish of St. John-the-Baptist, Bedford, at St. John's Rectory, Bedford, on the 2nd inst., aged 82.
Slacke, Rev. Richard Henry Ernest, Chaplain Bombay Establishment, younger son of the Rev. W. J. Slacke, Chaplain Northumberland County Asylum, at Satara, on Jan. 31st, aged 31.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE FAITH OF ABRAHAM.

By the Rev. W. DONE BUSHELL, M.A., Assistant Master in Harrow School, and late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Sermon Preached in the Chapel of St. John's College, Cambridge, on Sunday, November 18th, 1888.

"By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went."—Hebrews xi. 8.

"BY faith." Yes, certainly by faith; yet not a faith which was conservative and cautious; it was a faith which proved itself in energy and in endeavour. I do not now ask whether, as we most of us suppose, the patriarch stands a genuine historic personality, upon the threshold of the Old World history, an Arab Sheik to look upon, much as the Bedouin of the desert whom we may see to-day, or whether he shall be regarded only as the ideal national progenitor, eponymous and representative; it matters not; we take him as the writer here conceives him, a majestic figure in the dawn of Israel's destinies, obedient, faithful, self-surrendering, father of peoples, friend of God; and so the prototype of the discoverer, of the originator, of the reformer, to the end of time; of a Columbus sailing ever towards the setting sun; a Pilgrim Father on the *Mayflower's* deck in Plymouth Sound; a Gordon on his desert way towards Khartoum beneath the silent stars; or, if you will, a Luther at the Diet of Worms; a Paul now counting loss for Christ whatever things were aforetime gain to him. "Now, the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee." And Abram went out, not knowing whither he went.

Not knowing whither he went if only he obeyed the voice of God. This is the faith which has made men and nations great, the faith that God fulfils Himself in many ways, which therefore willingly not grudgingly, not self-regardingly but self-denyingly, is ready to obey His call; which therefore is the faith of all who trust that God is not the God of the dead but of the living, and that the ages ever grow in grace; which therefore is especially a young man's faith, shame if it be not so, for if Abram indeed was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran, yet was the old man's heart none other than the heart of a boy in readiness, in hopefulness, in vigour.

And I am speaking to the sons of men who built upon the river Hooghly some few factories, not knowing that God had called them there to rule a quarter of the human race; to the sons of men who have in faith, however incomplete a faith, subdued and peopled the waste places of the earth; and may I not assume that faith with such will have its activities, its energies, and its outgoings, no less than its defences, its assurances, and its repose?

But let us speak to-day of two points, having reference, one to the outer, one to the inner life of the Church of Christ, in each of which there seems to be especial room for this same hopeful faith of Abram. The first shall be the College Missions to the London poor. It is a new departure; and yet I think there never was a new departure which originated in a clearer call of God, or one which was encouraged by a richer promise. I trust that we were not unmindful thirty years ago that it was ever the part of England's gentlemen to minister to England's poor, and yet perhaps our thoughts were often concentrated rather on defence than on attack. The privileges of the Church within the University were passing from it one by one, and not a few were found to say, "If the foundations be destroyed what can the righteous do?" Well, you who have succeeded us, have at least found this to do; you have in your day once more learned the lesson that the truest tactics of defence may be an offensive war. We all have read how the beleaguered Roman bought at its full price the very ground on which the Carthaginian general was encamped, and all men know that there is no surer witness to the Church's life than missionary enterprise. As College therefore after College, School after School sends out its mission to the poor, a spiritual counterpart of that great intellectual extension of the Universities which is so marked a feature of the present time, we feel it is indeed a surer line of Church defence thus to go out to meet the enemy than to insist on any grudging recognition of position or prerogative at home. For so we prove our life, and so it is that such missions are like mercy, which "blesseth him that gives and him that takes."

But there is also "him that takes," not for one moment to be forgotten. We all know London more or less, and those who know it best are I suppose the most bewildered by its enormous weight of sordidness, of wretchedness, of sin. There is a population where the birth-rate is perhaps a hundred thousand every year; where there is yearly added on a town as large as Cambridge to its already overgrown immensity. And what does Lazarus want? He wants just what you have the power to give him, if you will give it in the faith of Abram. First he wants hope, both for this life and for a better life beyond it, such as the everlasting Gospel only can supply. And it is not too

late. If even now a London mob is not as a Paris mob, a Berlin mob, not so vindictive against wealth and culture and religion, it is because the faith in God, the hope of an immortality which shall redress the balance, has not yet died away, as we are told it has in great part died away elsewhere, but only needs a quickening and a renewing of which the mission church and the mission priest can be a centre still.

And, secondly, he wants a little human sympathy, a little beauty in his sordid life, a little wholesome pleasure and variety; and that too you can give him, hand to hand and heart to heart, and give it whether you are a clergyman or not, and give it whether you yourself accept the fulness of the truths of Christianity or not, if only in this one point you have the spirit of the Master within you.

And, thirdly, he wants help, whatever help the law can offer, be it more or less, to give to him and to his children a more equitable share in that vast wealth which is around him, yet not his; and those I think who have gone down to see him in his need will be less afraid of ugly words like Socialism, but will be likely to remember that the rights of man come first, and that the rights of property come second, and that the members of that foremost of democracies, the Catholic Church of Christ, cannot but look with all good will on anything which tends to bring about a fuller realisation of our common brotherhood, provided always it be in accordance with those claims of justice which are the expression of the unalterable will of God. It is a new departure, doubtless. Is it not however a new departure such as our Lady Margaret, as we see her on her knees in the College Hall, would most of all have wished? May it not be such a new departure as was Abram's when he left Haran for the Promised Land?

And now from this, an instance of the outward ministry and operations of the Church of Christ, may I pass on to what is an even more important topic, the hidden life of souls. And I would here ask this plain question, Do we not identify the the thought, the central thought of faith, too much with the holding fast the truth, too little with the going forth, albeit into the wilderness, in hope; almost sometimes as if we claimed a personal infallibility, or as if each missionary was not bound to say, "Trust God, and follow on wherever He may lead"? This I would ask: Do we not sometimes picture Faith to ourselves as sitting all-regretfully, nay well nigh all-despairingly, amidst the ruins of the past? Do not we find the age of faith not in the nineteenth, but perhaps in the thirteenth century? And yet, if we do this, are we not forgetting that although the faith was once for all delivered to the saints, yet that that faith was a potential, not a completed faith; at least a faith which had in it vast possibilities even of Churches yet unfounded, even of Gospels yet unwritten, even of Creeds yet undeveloped; they are there, if you will, implicitly, but only as the ear of wheat is in the tender blade, there that is to say in its God-given vitality, but none the less as yet unshaped by many an influence of air, and light, and rain, which shall hereafter mould its being. And shall we think, sons of the Reformation, sons of an Evangelical, and of a Catholic Revival, that God can have no further blessing yet in store for us? Is it for such as we are to deny the Catholic faith, albeit once for all delivered to the saints, to be a living organism, not a fossil, a power far more than a deposit? Should not ours rather be the words of the great Roman Cardinal, which well might be the Song of Degrees of Abram upon his journeyings;

> Lead, kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom,
> Lead thou me on?
> The night is dark, and I am far from home,
> Lead Thou me on?
> Keep Thou my feet; I do not ask to see
> The distant scene; one step enough for me.

And if we grant this principle, yet are we ready to apply it honestly and equally? For, of course, it is not every road which, like the road he followed, leads to Rome, and there are many no less faithful, if less gifted men than he, who go forth out of the Haran of their youth by quite another road. To them, and they are many, the old home lights are growing dim across their desert way; the Bible is no longer as it once was God's voice; one Book appears perhaps to be interpolated, one of later date than was once thought to be the case, another unauthentic. Or, again, the text no longer proves the doctrine as it did. They ask not only what do the words imply, but further, what is the value of that other factor, long neglected altogether, the varying authority with which the words were written. Or, yet again, not doubting in the possibility of the miraculous, they think that they have learned to gauge its genesis, and to discover under what conditions the miraculous is born; and so, perhaps, they find the well-loved Christmas story of the watching shepherds and the Virgin Mother, or even the sacred tale of Easter-day itself, to be a beautiful, a tender, an inimitable tale, yet nothing more.

What shall we say to such, we who regard it as the greatest of our blessings, if we have a firmer faith than they? To-day I will ask, May we not offer words of hope, the hope of Abram, instead of blame? At least let us be glad to recognise that where there is less certitude, there there is even wider scope for faithfulness; that though we may not know who He is, we yet may be quite sure that it is He who hath opened our eyes; that even when the hope of immortality itself is dim, the offering of a life becomes a larger and a nobler thing than ever it was before. And why not words of hope, for may not what we see around us prove at last to be a process rather of re-integration than of decay? Not that we make to any man a present of Catholic truth; it is not ours to give; but we do

gladly recognise that many such—and their case may be ours at any time, perhaps it partly is already—may now be going forth as Abram did, inevitably, obediently, regretfully, but also hopefully.

This, surely, we may do on this condition, that we find reverence, humility, sincerity, and self-surrender, be it in ourselves or others: if we remember, therefore, that there is in many of us a personal equation making on the side of infidelity, whilst we sincerely think ourselves to be as impartial as the judge upon his seat; if we remember, therefore, that the verdict of the Universal Church is more than any man's opinion; if, therefore, further, we have nought to do with irony, or ridicule, or scorn in dealing with those sacred things before which an Augustine or an Anselm veiled their faces; if, therefore, we put far away from us that reckless spirit which believes that it can adequately settle such great questions in a half hour's discussion at the dinner-table, or in the pages of some ephemeral magazine. For indeed we do not want more critics or more cynics; we want more lowliness, more penitence, more love. But granted these, should we not say, be it to others or to ourselves, Be faithful to the light you seem at least to see, the call you seem at least to hear, and God, who is the God of truth, may guide you to a promised land not wholly different from that from which you have gone out; or if He do not, yet in our Father's house are many mansions.

Surely much wrong is done by forcing men to what appears to us to be the logical conclusion of their premises; surely more justice when we gladly recognise that men are better Christians sometimes than they know. No; it is needful to discriminate. A man may scarcely part with the beliefs which he has held, excepting as with the wife whom he has loved, or with the mother who has nursed him, or with the child whom he has begotten; but when in reverence, in humility, in self-surrender he believes he hears that call, imperative and strong, which he may not resist, then is the time not to resent, or to discourage, but, little as it may be that we can do, to help and guide.

And this for many reasons, and for this one especially and lastly, that there remains for all of us that going forth from Haran which will clear up all doubts, and which will come to all of us alike. We may discuss, perhaps we cannot but discuss, be it the wearing of a Chasuble, be it the date of Deuteronomy, be it the Virgin Birth of an Incarnate God; but then one day there comes perchance a breath of colder air, a little pain upon the chest, a spasm, and we know more about such things than libraries or the Decrees of Councils now can tell us. And what will really matter then? I do not say opinion will not matter; we have a very real, a very deep responsibility for our beliefs, and yet far more will matter how we have borne ourselves and what we were in the believing, or the doubting, or the denying. At least, have we been faithful to that changeless principle of duty which is the voice of the Eternal in the soul? At least have we believed that it was better to be loving than to secure a point in argument? At least have we not used our doubts to construct a vantage ground for our self-pleasing? We do not say that they who thus go forth shall know no perils by the way, here or hereafter, in their wilderness of wandering; but we do say that they are not being driven out as aliens, but are being led out as sons; that God, the God of Abram, who is the God not of the dead but of the living, will be their God, will be to them upon their way a pillar as of cloud by day and as of fire by night.

THE HARDENING OF THE HEART.

By the Rev. Prof. HENSLOW, M.A., F.L.S.

Sermon Preached in Christ Church, Ealing, on Sunday, February 17th, 1889.

"Harden not your hearts, as in the Provocation. Like as in the Day of Temptation in the Wilderness, wherewith your fathers tempted me."—Heb. iii. 8, 9.

We not infrequently read, both in the Old and New Testaments, of the "hardening of man's heart" either against God or against his fellow-man. Sometimes he is accused of hardening his own heart, and thereby of sinning against God. Thus Pharaoh is said to have "sinned yet more, and hardened his heart" (Exodus ix. 34). At other times we read that *God* hardens man's heart, as in Exodus iv. 21, God said of Pharaoh, "I will harden his heart:" and again (Exodus ix. 12) we read, "The Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart." Similarly, Joshua (xi. 20) says that God hardened the hearts of the tribes in Canaan, so that they came against Israel and were destroyed, as it was God's intention to drive out the nations from before His people.

Although our Lord asked of the disciples when they reasoned among themselves on having taken no bread with them into the boat: "Have ye your heart hardened?" and invariably denounced the hard-heartedness of the Pharisees, yet does the Evangelist allude to Isaiah as referring the hardness of the heart of the Jews to the Lord's doing. Thus we read in St. John xii. 37, 40, 41: "Though He had done so many signs before them, yet they believed not on Him: that the word of Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake . . . He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart. These things said Isaiah because he saw His glory, and spake of Him."

Lastly, St. Paul (Rom. ix. 15), referring to Pharaoh, seems to speak of God's determination to be almost arbitrary in His distribution of mercy and

judgment: "For He saith to Moses, 'I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy.' . . . So then He hath mercy on whom He will, and whom He will He hardeneth."

But, as though there might be a possibility of misunderstanding him, he explains what he means (v. 22): "What, if God, willing to show His wrath, endured with much long-suffering vessels of wrath *fitted* unto destruction, and that He might make known the riches of His glory upon vessels of mercy . . . . even us, whom He also called, not from the Jews only, but also from the Gentiles." Here, then, we find the interpretation of all those passages in which God is said to harden man's heart. In other words, "the vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction, were *the wilfully impenitent*, the vessels of mercy being *Christians*. St. Paul, who was so familiar with the Old Testament, drew his parallel from the establishment of the Israelites in Canaan and the destruction of the inhabitants; indeed, Joshua describes the salvation of Israel in almost the same words: "It was of the Lord," he says (Joshua xi. 20), "to harden their hearts, to come against Israel in battle, that He might utterly destroy them, that they might have no favour, but that He might destroy them, as the Lord commanded Moses."

In both cases, viz., that of the ancient Canaanites and of the later impenitent Jews and Gentiles, the hardening of the heart followed outrageous wickedness. On the one hand, in the abominations attached to the idolatrous worship, involving even the burning of their sons and daughters; and on the other, the grossly immoral lives of the Greeks and Romans, which involved the hardening of the heart of the heathen nations, and, indeed, of the Jews as well, in the times of Christ and St. Paul.

That the hardening of his heart was really *a man's own fault* is repeatedly recognised in both Testaments. In Deut. xv. 7 the Israelite is warned against hardening his heart towards the poor. In Proverbs xxviii. 14 and xxix., 1 calamities are asserted as befalling those who harden their heart or stiffen their neck with pride.

Again and again do the prophets accuse their countrymen of hardening their hearts against God, and for serving other gods. Yet, again, does Isaiah, on the other hand, cry out, "Why dost Thou make us to err from Thy ways, and hardenest our heart from Thy fear?" (lxiii. 17).

Now, when we compare these and other passages, we thus find it said that God hardens men's hearts, as well as that God blames men for having their hearts hardened. How can we reconcile these two classes of expressions? It is to be observed that they do not stand alone. There are many passages in the Bible in which it is said that either God, or Satan, or some evil spirit emanating from God Himself, is the direct agent in arousing evil in a man's heart. Thus it is said of Saul: "The Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him." Again we read in the Second Book of Samuel how "the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and *He* moved David against them, saying, Go, number Israel and Judah" (2 Sam. xxiv. 1). In 1 Chron. xxi. 1, however, we learn that it was "Satan who stood up against Israel, and moved David to number Israel." Lastly, in 1 Kings xxii. 23, we read: "Now, therefore, behold the Lord hath put a lying spirit into the mouth of all these thy prophets." But you will remember that our Lord said to the Jews: "Ye are of your your father the devil . . . . When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father thereof" (John viii. 44).

By contrasting a few passages in this way a somewhat startling result is arrived at; for, on the face of them, the passages I have quoted make it appear as if God and Satan were one! Now, this fact is not without significance, when we think of the well-nigh universal existence of serpent-worship. For while, on the one hand, the serpent has been regarded as an evil deity, on the other, since it was generally believed that the same being which inflicted sickness and death could heal and quicken, and that the serpent alone was supposed able to counteract its own bite, the serpent actually became associated with the healing art. Æsculapius, the god of healing, was represented by a snake, and a rod entwined by a snake is still the symbol of the modern physician. When, therefore, serpents became regarded as beneficent beings, one step further elevated them into the position of beneficent gods. Hence in Guatemala, a Saga, or sacred legend, says: "In the beginning was only God, the Creator, the mighty Serpent."

To return to the Old Testament

The real fact appears to be that, in the earlier periods of history especially, men attributed not only every event *external* to them, but every *internal* change of mind to the influence of some spiritual agency; and at a time when men believed in the existence of many gods, it was some one of them that was supposed to influence them at one time, another god at another time. The Israelites, however, were a nation which had learned to believe in One God only. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is One Lord." But they still seem to have believed in the existence of various spiritual agencies (though they did not call them gods) which they supposed must come from Him. Hence Jehovah is described not only as the Author of the bounties of nature, but of all physical evils as well. Thus Isaiah says of God (xlv. 7), "I form the light and create darkness. I make peace and create evil; I am the Lord that doeth all these things." If their corn and wine and oil increased, and the nation was at peace and prosperous, it was due to the goodness of God. If they were driven before the sword, and

discomfited by their enemies, or slain in thousands by the plague or famine, again it was Jehovah who sent His angel of destruction to fulfil His vengeance.

The Israelites, though still not quite correct in their ideas, had made a more nearly correct approach to the truth than their ancestors, who believed in many gods. They were right in believing in One God, but were wrong in attributing to Him spirits which He could (as they imagined) send out to affect mankind in various ways.

What they called *spirits* we now recognise under the term of *natural forces*, so that events which they attributed to the direct and immediate will of Jehovah, we regard as the inevitable results of certain conditions in accordance with the arrangements which the Creator had established when He made this world and every thing that is in it.

Thus of the three great judgments of Jehovah—the sword, the famine, and the plague—we know that plagues and pestilences are due to insanitary and other conditions which we can largely meet and prevent. Again, if the theory prove to be true, that about every ten or eleven years there occur certain well ascertained peculiarities in the sun and that these affect the climate of the world, so that excessive drought occurs periodically in countries such as India, most influenced by them, then the result is a periodical famine, which we can foresee and so forestall. Such, then, are material consequences which *must* follow preceding natural conditions. Consequently, the more knowledge we can acquire about the distribution of cold and heat, storm and vapour, infection and Bacteria "fulfilling God's word," so much the better shall we be able to foresee the effects and anticipate any catastrophe, such as a periodical famine in India, a visitation of small-pox and cholera, or cattle disease in England.

We do not now regard God as constantly interfering, so to say, once in ten years to punish India with a famine. We learn by discoveries to regard everything in the constitution of the world as the result of God's laws and arrangements which He made from the beginning. Since the more we investigate the history of the world, the formation of the rocks, the growth of plants and animals, the more convinced do we become that the laws which we recognise now are identically the same as ruled the world in its earliest days. The sun shone, the rain fell, plants grew, and animals multiplied, slew and devoured one another, on the face of the earth, myriads of years before man was created, just as they do now. Many floods came, and drowned God's creatures in former days, just as they come and drown men now. We do not say that an angel, with a drawn sword, flies over the land when the cholera breaks out; but we at once look to our sanitary arrangements, and try to amend what is defective, for we now know the exact causes of pestilences, which we can, to a large extent prevent, if we do but use that intelligence and forethought which as much come from God as famine and fever.

I have hitherto referred to God's laws *external* to us; but there are laws which govern our own minds, and which are from Him too. Moreover, man is equally to be on his guard in this department of nature, lest a moral plague overwhelm him, or the starvation of his soul follow his neglect of spiritual sustenance.

The hardening of the heart spoken of in Scripture is a result of certain conditions—natural laws of the mind—which man knows of, and must avoid, for it will as inevitably follow, as a fever will be the result of neglected drainage. The one, as the other, is equally a result of God's laws.

What, then, *is* this hardening of the heart, and what are the causes that bring it about?

By referring to the few passages I have quoted it is easy to see that several mental states can be the cause. With Saul it was simply jealousy, pride, and bad temper. With the Israelites generally it was a persistence in idolatry and its evil practices, with a refusal to listen to the pleadings of the prophets. With many persons now it is a callous indifference to the wants and rights of others born of *selfishness*, which, after all, lies at the root of it; for this is the polluted fountain which gives forth the fœtid waters of lust, pride, jealousy, anger, malice, revenge, and murder.

Our Lord denounced, in no measured terms, the hard-heartedness of the pharisaical hypocrites of His day, and illustrated it by the parable of the Good Samaritan. He would not have said, "Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites!" if they had not been to blame, or if a spirit of evil had really entered them over which they had no control. They could not say, "It is not I, but Jehovah, that tempts me, or hath sent a lying spirit to make me like Satan," for they knew that "God really tempts no man to sin; but that he is led away of his own lusts, and enticed," as St. James says. No! They had Moses and the prophets, but would not hear them. Where would have been the purport or force of the parable of the Good Samaritan if the Jews of our Lord's day had habitually paid any heed to these words of Moses: "If there be with thee a poor man, one of thy brethren . . . . thou shalt not harden thine heart, nor shut thine hand from thy poor brother; but thou shalt surely open thine hand unto him, and shalt surely lend him sufficient for his need in that which he wanteth" (Deut. xv. 7, 8). They must have heard this read over and over again on the Sabbath-days in the synagogues; likewise the words, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," and many others like them; but they voluntarily refused to listen, like the deaf adder which stoppeth her ears, and refuseth to be charmed. They, too, had ears to hear with, but would not hearken; eyes to see with, but would not behold.

What was the consequence of this determined blindness of Israel? It was a law of their moral nature, as it is now of ours; that a hardening of the heart inevitably followed. Do we not see it repeatedly now? Is not the utterly selfish *roué* the most callous of men? How hardly can a rich man, who trusts in riches and abuses them for his own lusts alone, enter into the kingdom of heaven, and much less allow the spiritual Lord of the kingdom of heaven to enter his own heart?

The hardening of the heart may exist or extend to every degree; from an occasional act of selfishness and indifference to the small wants of those about us, to a contemptuous callousness of suffering, till it reaches that pitch of malignity which actually delights in and gloats over the tortures of our fellow-creatures.

To guard ourselves against falling into this last appalling state, we must be on the alert against the first step downwards; and the best way to avoid that is always to be on the watch to be practically unselfish, to cultivate that sweet and kindly temper of mind known under the term *amiability*, for that is the germ of true Christian love.

No one here present is now likely to accuse God as being the author of a wicked, jealous temper, like Saul's, or a selfish, boastful heart like David's, or a lying tongue like that of those prophets of old. We all know that we *ourselves* are to blame, and well deserve whatever retribution God may see fit to mete out to us if we do not check the rising temper, stop the lie which springs to the tongue, and crush the egotistic and selfish feeling as soon as we are conscious of it in our heart, for out of the heart, and that *alone*, proceeds all that defiles a man.

There is yet another cause of hardening the heart to which our Lord makes frequent mention, and that, too, where it might be least expected, namely, in doing what is supposed to be God's service. As long as worship and religious service consist of ceremonious acts alone, *i.e.*, in observing the letter, then the heart is sure to become hardened; for the letter killeth, while the spirit alone giveth life. The Pharisees of old were the very personification of letter-service, and they were the most hard-hearted of the Jews at that time. The beneficent act of the Good Samaritan had more true religion in it than all the tithings of cumin and anise, and all kinds of herbs, about which they were so self-satisfied. It was the letter-service of their religion that killed all sympathy and kindliness in the hearts of the priest and Levite of the Parable. As it was then, so is there a like danger *now*. Remember that religious services do you no good, if they do not soften, but harden your heart. Mere observance is worse than useless if you leave this church with your temper as ready to rise as ever, at the slightest provocation and imaginary insult to your vanity and pride.

There are many things which may tend to harden the heart, but we must remember that in all cases *we alone* are to blame if they do so; and that if Christ were here on earth now, there may be several of us to whom He would say, "Woe unto you, hypocrites, ye worship Me with your lips, but your hearts are far from Me." "God is a spirit, and they who would worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

THE degree of Master of Arts has been conferred on the Rev. Frederic Mann, Curate of Woodford, Essex, after examination.

MR. MADAN, student of Christ Church, and a lay member of the Central African Mission, gave on Thursday, in one of the large examination rooms, in the new schools at Oxford, an exceedingly interesting account of the Mission, from its inauguration by Livingstone down to the present time. The lecture was illustrated by excellent views. The account was partly chronological, partly topographical in arrangement. Starting with Livingstone and the Zambesi, it went on past Bishop Mackenzie's grave to the great lakes, then turned coastward again to Zanzibar, passing native villages and encampments, and a slave caravan on its way. With Zanzibar itself the audience was made quite familiar; its shore front, its streets, the old slave market, and the new cathedral and St. Andrew's College at Kiungani. Finally, the spectators were taken to Pangani, and so up to Magila; they were introduced to the buildings there, the church, to Archdeacon Farler taking his class of chiefs, and finally to the Bishop himself. The lecture brought home to the audience in a singularly vivid way the details and realities of the Mission and of Missionary life, while the serious tones in which the lecturer spoke of the dangers, probably greater in the future than in the past, which the Bishop and the members of the Mission were bound to encounter, profoundly impressed and moved those who were present.

AT St. Mary's, Oxford, on Sunday, Professor Cheyne gave the first of his course of Bampton Lectures for the present year. The subject of the lectures is "The Composition and History of the Psalter." To judge by this first lecture the Professor's criticism is of a somewhat ruthless and uncompromising kind, sweeping away many old and cherished beliefs respecting the Psalms. To the attempt to assign definite dates to the different books of the Psalter there can, of course, be no objection; only the fate which has, on the whole, attended the many attempts which have been made in Germany and in this country to assign the books of the New Testament to very late dates (attempts which it is scarcely too much to say are now generally discredited) should make scholars and their hearers rather chary of being in too great a hurry to accept as final the very late dates to which modern critics are inclined at present to attribute the authorship of many of the writings of the Old Testament Scriptures. Meanwhile, some of us are inclined to wonder whether courses of this kind fairly fulfil the intention of the founder of the lecture, and whether, while we would not for a moment limit the liberty of prophesying, it is yet desirable that theories which must be in their first result unsettling and negative should be in the first instance delivered under cover of the name of John Bampton.

Certain HARNESS' Cure.
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
FOR
RHEUMATISM
Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh, writes:—"*The Electropathic Belt has* **completely cured** *me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense agony for two years. I now feel strong and active.*"
Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. **Pamphlet & Advice free on application** to **Mr. C. B. Harness,** *Consulting Electrician,* the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
Only Address,
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W. (*Corner of Rathbone Place.*)
Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 16, 1889.

WORKING-MEN'S CLUBS.

ONE of the great problems which it will be necessary for the Church to face sooner or later is that of the course to be adopted by the clergy with regard to working-men's clubs; and this question is one of wide interest, inasmuch as there are comparatively few parishes in which some such institution does not, or will not, soon exist. With regard, then, to the formation of working-men's clubs, are the clergy to countenance their formation, or even to be the originators of the movement? It seems to us that, given a locality in which several hundreds of the labouring classes are living in close proximity, sooner or later there will be some attempt at the formation of a club; and, therefore, supposing none to exist, the parson has to ask himself whether or no it is his province to take the lead in this matter, and so render the men of his parish under an obligation to him. We venture to think *not*, except under exceptional circumstances. Many of the most Radical and Atheistical clubs of this sort have found their origin in the kind effort of some clergyman who has in time gone by devoted much time, thought, and money on nursing the viper which ultimately bit him. The constitution of most clubs is of a somewhat vague nature, only those rules which protect it from external injury being deemed necessary. Many of these clubs, as soon as they are able to make a little show of comfort, want to be "affiliated," and this gives rise to the first difference of opinion between the clergymen and the members of the club. The club, however, generally gets the best of it, as the parson, not realising the full meaning of the course proposed, is half persuaded, half coerced, into giving in to the affiliation. This done, there is soon a fresh demand on the part of the members, and that is for Beer; and then he realises, when too late, that he has lost a great deal of his influence, and does not know what course to take. This results, generally, in a "split," and the originator of the club finds himself posing, according to their own account, as the enemy of the very men whom he has so long and anxiously been trying to befriend. What is he to do? He has to get rid of the club if on his premises, or, if not, to retire from his position at once. The members, now "free," soon sink down to the low level of a drinking or gambling club, and, as long as they can hold together, are a fertile source of trouble to their quondam benefactor. In one club which is known to us the clergy not only went so far as to give in over the drink question, but even permitted the club to meet on Sundays, and even, we believe, sanctioned dramatic or semi-dramatic performances. But even in this case, after having yielded every point, there was something lacking, and the members were unable to rest until, by some contrivance or other, they had shown their gratitude by formally excluding those very clergy from their club. We grieve to be obliged to acknowledge that similar instances are rather the rule than the exception; and, therefore, the question becomes all the more important. Are the clergy, then, we ask, to avoid in every case starting a working-men's club? This is, indeed, a difficult question. Provided a man is able to devote considerable time to its conduct we would not altogether dissuade him from the attempt; but we would most certainly advise him to lay down for himself the following rules in each case as a *sine quâ non*:—(1) The non-affiliation of the club; (2) that the property be kept in his own hands; (3) and that he be virtually, if not nominally, the autocrat of the establishment, with a full power of veto not infrequently put into force. Under these—but only under these—circumstances we believe it need not be impossible to successfully found and carry on a working-men's club such as shall have a direct bearing of religious life. There must, however, be the proviso that some one of direct religious influence shall be nearly, if not always present, as nothing is so dangerous to the welfare of the club as "leaving them alone." With regard, however, to the advantage to be gained by these clubs, we cannot see that it is at all proportionate to the energy and effort expended upon them. A working-men's club is like a wild beast which must always be kept muzzled, and which rarely, if ever, shows or feels one spark of gratitude for any amount of attention and support that may have been lavished upon it. In view of these facts we do not believe that the Church, and especially the clergy, could be justifiably brought to task for neglecting to start or to support a working-men's club of the same nature as those which surround us on every side to-day.

THE PRUDENTIAL ASSURANCE COMPANY.

THE report read at the fortieth annual general meeting of this assurance company, held at the chief office, Holborn Bars, Mr. Edgar Horne in the chair, stated that the number of policies issued in the Ordinary branch during the year was 42,475, assuring the sum of £4,399,769, and producing a new annual premium income of £235,487. The premiums received during the year were £718,848, being an increase of £183,717 over the year 1887. The expenses were 1¼ per cent. lower than in the previous year. The directors were able to state that their efforts to promote the stability of industrial policies continued to be very successful; for, notwithstanding the enormous increase in this branch during the past two years, the average duration of the 8,063,293 policies in force on December 31 last was now no less than six years. Nearly 40,000 free policies had been granted during the year to those policy-holders of five years' standing who had desired to discontinue their payments. The total assets of the company had been raised during the year from £7,867,103 to £9,302,007, being an increase of £1,434,904. The chairman, in moving the adoption of the report, said that during the forty years he had been a director of the company, he did not think a more gratifying report had been presented to the shareholders. There could be little doubt that before the next meeting they would have gained the proud position of heading every other company with an accumulated sum exceeding £10,000,000. (Cheers.) Mr. Harben seconded the motion, and in so doing drew attention to the mode in which they had increased their invested funds. The motion was unanimously adopted, and the retiring directors were re-appointed.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

LENT is the season of self-examination. One of those epochs in the Church's year, which are set apart for the more regular and solemn investigation of our standing in religious matters. A time in which we do well, more particularly to inquire, how far we are rendering full allegiance and hearty service to our great heavenly Master; what use we are making of our many Christian privileges; what progress we are making on the strait road which leads to everlasting life. And surely, if we have endeavoured, if we continue to prosecute any such enquiry we shall, without doubt, learn one great truth—*our own entire weakness.* In these days of great intellectual advance, we are wont to boast of the power of the will; of the control of mind over matter—and God forbid that we should ever undervalue these valuable aids towards the attainment of a holy life! But yet, those who know themselves, with a knowledge gained at the foot of the Cross, will be compelled to admit their own impotency, unhelped by some higher power, some greater force than intellect. Happy those who, having reached thus far, have learnt also where to seek the strength they need! Happy they who can say, with a sweet certainty, that they speak not in vain—"Almighty God, keep us both outwardly in our bodies, and inwardly in our souls!" Oh! let us cultivate more and more a childlike, perfect assurance, that our God *listens* and *is able.* And let us not be ashamed or afraid to pray to Him, concerning those small, yet to us, important things, which may well be included in the idea "outwardly in our bodies." Pleasures or Providences, which we desire for ourselves and others, all may be asked for "if it be His will"—the only veto upon our expectations. And if we should and do pray for these things which perish, much more should we implore the aid of our God in the continual warfare which we wage with the arch-enemy. We would pray to be kept *absolutely pure* "in our souls"; to be defended from all those evils which "assault our souls"; to be so defended, to be, by the grace of God, so on the alert, that the more serious danger the "hurt" to our souls should never come. This and much more this week's collect means, let us pray it earnestly, and expect an answer.

RELIGIOUS ANIMOSITY.

BY W. WALTERS, ESQ., B.A., LONDON.

(*Continued from page* 117.)

PRELATES, they urge, have been time-serving and have not resisted as they should have done the encroachments of the secular government. Statutes have been passed, but the spiritual rulers have not made them. Decisions have been given by legal tribunals, but these were not according to the facts. If you say that custom is against the revived practices, they will have it that carelessness and irreverence combined with unworthy concession to Puritanism accounts for many omissions. You are shown that custom is not so unvaryingly against them as Evangelical authorities affirm. There are old fonts evidently constructed with a view to that immersion which the Prayer-book requires. Copes and a cope chest here and there exist in cathedral sacristies. Incense has been used within comparatively modern times. Turning to the east, bowing at the Doxology have in some remote parishes never died out. Public penance has been done in the memory of living men. A Royal confessor was appointed even till late Georgian days. Per contra, Ritualists challenge authority for the use of the black gown, for placing the elements on the Holy Table before Morning Prayer begins, for the use of metrical hymns, for the omission of the Apocrypha from modern Bibles, for baptisms where no congregation is present, for the neglect of daily public service, for the pew system as now existing, for the sale of presentations to Church benefices.

But, supposing prosecution to be in every case successful, all that can be effected is that the men can be driven out of the Church, and perhaps fined and punished in various ways. It is impossible, however, to drive out an opinion by such means. Disestablish the Church, or thoroughly Protestantise it, the men are still here—they will carry on their practices just as before—and, in a free country such as ours, will erect fresh buildings and draw proselytes as much as they did previously. It is only the Inquisition—and that only in Spain—which is competent to root out an obnoxious principle at once and for ever.

In pleading, however, to be "let alone," they certainly ask for too much. No one can "let alone" principles which he feels to be false, injurious, and

even deadly. The men who ask for such toleration are not prepared to extend it. They feel that since they are alone possessed of truth to allow of any deviation from it, if the power were afforded them of preventing error, would be sinful negligence. In fact, if the truth were attained by the majority of mankind on any subject, there could be no such thing as toleration. It is only our uncertainty that renders such a thing possible. In all cases where we think that such certainty has been reached, and that injurious effects would follow from a course opposed to the right one, we do not tolerate : a professor of mathematics at a university dare not teach the system of Ptolemy as a correct exposition of the planetary order ; a medical man would be ineligible for house-surgeon at a hospital, if he announced his intention to proceed simply according to the principles of homœopathy—the majority of people are sure that small-pox is kept off by vaccination—no private judgment is allowed to form a ground of exemption from compliance with the law on the point.

Society in the mediæval period felt as certain that the principles of religion then held and taught were correct as we do now that the Newtonian science and the atomic theory and the discovery made by Jenner are quite beyond doubt. Perhaps they were even more certain. Now if the Catholic world believed that it had the truth—if it surely knew that men were spreading views adverse to this truth—if it thought that by the destruction of these false teachers the error would be rooted out, and thereby souls innumerable saved from perishing everlastingly—were they not on those principles perfectly justified in persecuting to the death those whom they were convinced were drawing multitudes to damnation ?

Philip of Spain and Torquemada were, therefore, benefactors of their race. Looking upon heresy as he did, was it not a noble remark of Philip, that were Don Carlos such an one, he would commit him to the flames ?

The duty, then, of those who love truth and charity is not to "let alone," but to contend against with moderation and in love, using not so much the weapons of sarcasm, controversy, and the law court as those of a godly life, of love to all men, of devotion to Christ. When we are weak, then shall we be strong.

Unreasoning has been the opposition to changes which were beneficial, or to innovations which are now seldom objected to.

Intoning the prayers was thought an eminent mark of Popish leanings. When in a Somersetshire church the psalms were first chanted, a zealous Protestant wondered that the roof did not fall in. When in a certain case a memorial window was not allowed, the churchwarden publicly stated that such a thing would be a step nearer to Rome and further from God. The "white gown" has raised storms of opposition. Even recently a clergyman dressed his choir boys in blue instead of the Romish white.

One Vicar required Amen to be intoned only with the English enunciation, and conversely another coming to a new parish, was dubbed a Puseyite, because he permitted the word to be sung at the end of each hymn. A colonial chaplain was rebuked for Ritual tendencies, because he spoke of kneeling at Divine Service. In a Norfolk parish a clergyman of Simeon's school was deserted by his choir in a body. For why? He objected to the men sitting within the communion rails on a bench behind the table.

For years it has been announced that Puseyism or Ritualism would be shortly put down. The result has not been as foretold ; the movement has steadily advanced. Here and there ruffians have been urged to interrupt services and commit depredations, but such means of repression only discredit those who employ them.

Even the proceedings of the courts against contumacious clerks have not won much sympathy, and it is doubtful if a persistent Ritualist will be again imprisoned, this proceeding savours over much of the old persecuting High Commission times.

Let it not be supposed that all these things have come upon us without a cause. Protestantism has in many ways been a failure. The right of private judgment has been made to cover all manner of strange opinions, and has developed pretty nearly with the right of every man to do that which is right in his own eyes. The "open Bible," of which English Protestants talk so much, has been supposed to mean that a perfect scheme and code had been transmitted by God to man, out of which each one might concoct his own system without regard to anything excepting only the opinion of the sect to which he chanced to belong. So it has been assumed that the Holy Spirit is ever ready to instruct each one *de novo*, and without human assistance, in all that is necessary to be known. The host of conflicting sects, each professing to have their views on the Scripture, has not proved a warning. Men have said Prayer is the sole requisite for getting enlightenment in the word, that the priest's voice was nothing, and that this alone was true doctrine which was implanted by the Spirit on the mind of each individual Christain. But it has been quite overlooked that the priest in few cases ever spoke of his own authority, or gave his own opinion as the standard which men were to follow. Where the priest has done anything in the way of authoritative statement, it has been rather by giving the judgment of other and earlier times than by enforcing his own notions. If prayer be supposed essential to the right understanding of Scripture, is it to be thought that the holy men of old did not apply themselves in a humble, prayerful spirit to its study ? If we reach conclusions differing from these which a majority of men formed after a lifetime of prayer, closed perhaps by a death of martyrdom, are we more likely to be taught of the Spirit than were they ?

Members of the Church of England seem to forget that the rule of faith is not the Bible simply *et per se*, but that same Scripture, as understood by the First Four General Councils. And while it is distinctly and wisely stated that nothing is to be required as an essential article of faith but what is read in the Scriptures, adding also "it may be proved thereby," it never supposes that the doctors of these ancient assemblies had decided anything at variance with the written word. They did not deduce by reasoning processes the truth from the Scriptures, but rather gave themselves to the inquiry as to what truth had been held in Apostolic times, and how did the men of the first ages understand the inspired records of the Christian Church.

The name Protestant, once expressive of pure Gospel doctrine, is less powerful than formerly. Originally, a political term for those who protested against the intolerant decree of the Spires Diet, it has about it a sound of opposition and contest. And among that part of Continental Christendom which appropriates the title, there is not so very much to render it revered. The piety, which marked the few generations after the Reformation, has given place to

cold indifference. A Protestant may mean one who rejects all revelation, or who at best views Christianity as a fair system of ethics.

Even in our country, the gain by the Reformation has been but partial. Not only has Church wealth been scattered, livings impoverished, churches stripped of their rich embellishments, but there are other drawbacks.

As a matter of fact, we are not so religious as we used to be. The name of God is omitted from wills and bills of lading ; if mentioned in conversation, it is less as a pious ejaculation than as an oath. We are far removed from an age that put the cross at the end of the child's alphabet ; and if idle youths write doggrel verses in their books, they do not finish by owning Christ as their Salvation. Take up any old book, and compare its tone with that of any modern one not professedly a religious one, and the difference will be seen at once in the habitual references to the Deity in the one, and the entire silence in the other. Would you expect to find a modern tale interspersed with the thoughts of Robinson Crusoe? Miracle plays were no doubt bad enough, but still their tendency was higher than that of most modern ones. Till the last few years, kneeling at church had become an obsolete custom ; the ringing of the church bells, from being a religious ceremony, had been, and unfortunately often now is, a mere pastime associated with much that is objectionable and wholly foreign to the House of God. The Church was an exclusive place ; very comfortable, perhaps, for the wealthy, but quite another thing often for the poor. In theory, the parish priest is supposed to be a centre of civilisation to the dark homes of the rural districts, but he has not always been so in practice.

Too often the parish priest was a squire, a sportsman, a *bon vivant*, even if not absolutely immoral. He flattered the wealthy ; dispensed, as a magistrate, hard justice to the offending labourer.

It is also to the lasting disgrace of Protestantism that it allowed the old buildings to fall into decay ; that it repaired them without the slightest attention to propriety of style ; that it built new ones unapproached in their intense ugliness. Ever since the Reformation a blight seemed to fall on ecclesiastical buildings, which, in not a few instances, were miserably uncomfortable, out of repair, or altogether deserted.

It is to the honour of the Catholic movement that it has done so much to alter this state of things. The amount of reverence now displayed in congregations is far in excess of what it formerly was. The surpliced choir is objected to by many, but it is a vast improvement on the system of employing children of the charity school perched in a gallery to lead the devotions of the people.

(*To be continued.*)

THE Rev. C. I. Atherton, diocesan Missioner and rector of Faringdon, is to be appointed to the canonry of Exeter Cathedral, vacant through the death of Canon Lee. It is stated by the *Exeter Gazette* that by the *annus post mortem* rule of the Chapter, Mr. Atherton will receive no income from his canonry for the next twelve months, but will resign the living of Faringdon in the course of this year, and give himself to cathedral and diocesan work.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CANDID FRIENDS AND KIND CRITICS.

SIR,—We have two examples of these in an article in the *Church Times* for this week. These candid friends are that paper itself, and the *Tablet*.

1. The *Church Times* tells us that Romanists increase here in Ireland, and the reason it gives is that the Irish Church is Puritanised. Now, I question both fact and cause. Romanists are prolific, but so are other Irish people. Romanists do not increase here in proportion to others ; this is a myth. We have no 'verting in Ireland, no priest's books, etc. Mixed marriages are our only drain. These may increase through our not having so many resident clergymen as we had before. This is Mr. Gladstone's doing, who robbed the Church of its income, on the pretence that England set up a church here for the conversion of Romanists ; that it had failed in this, and was, therefore, to be robbed and degraded. If we are hurt, it was England's doing. So much for our losing our members. Then, as to cause. Our Prayer Book has not been altered in any perceptible doctrinal respect. The Revisionists, I know, tried ; but, thank God, they failed ! The queerest thing they did was to blot out "the Ornaments Rubric," on the pretence that it was not in our copy accompanying the Act of Parliament, but that was because the leaf with the Rubric was missing. This is plain, from the "catch-word" on the leaf preceding. I had this from the late Dr. Studdert. But it can be seen by anyone examining the copy. But the Revisionist scheme from end to end is to be read in their report of the year 1871. Having got rid of fact and reason, I now turn to our other critic, the *Tablet*, with whom the *Church Times* seems to harmonise.

2. The *Tablet* says that however the Lincoln case ends, it will prove that the Crown is the arbiter of the doctrines of the Church of England. This is unmitigated nonsense. If the last appeal must be to the Privy Council, this only means, as to the meaning of the formularies of the Church, which were drawn up by the Spirituality. There must be an appeal somewhere—once it was to the Pope — now it must end in the courts of the realm. They have been set up against the Papal court, not against God, as Rome pretends.

3. If the Church of England were disestablished, there would be no change in this respect. In that case, if the Bishop of Lincoln were accused of teaching or acting contrary to the Prayer Book, the case would end exactly as it must now, in an appeal to the Privy Council. The Irish Church is disestablished. But if any clergyman were to defy our General Synod, and try to hold benefice, the appeal would be to the Law Courts. It would be so with any disputing minister. Nay, if Archbishop Walsh were to try to introduce at Marlborough Street Chapel any novel rites or doctrines, and to defy his superiors, they would have to appeal to the Queen or Council to put him out.

4. It is all rubbish what Rome and its admirers say of the Queen being the head of the Church, and her supremacy. All it means is, that comment ends here and not at Rome. It was for this that Moore and Fisher and other martyrs died.

5. As to the meaning of our formularies, lawyers are the only safe judges; they may err, as they did in the Graham case, but such mistakes can and will be amended yet. Theologians are led away by their own prejudices. Lawyers must go by law and the plain words. If they err, they will be pulled up. If there should be a decision displeasing to the Lincoln school, there may be some 'verts, as there were after the Graham decision. But this was purely asinine. Why leave a church because of a faulty decision of the courts? Would Archbishop Walsh leave his church, if a decision as to Marlborough Street Chapel were adverse to him? There is no end to people's folly!

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

THE SIGN OF JONAH THE PROPHET.

SIR,—The Ritualistic trial of the Bishop of Lincoln is looked upon by many as a matter of supreme importance, fraught with dire results to the Church and attracting all attention, while the slowly solving process of modern criticism and resetting of our biblical opinions are comparatively unnoticed. So are the outward shows the least themselves. It is an immense gain to religion that we may boldly and yet reverently handle each topic of critical interest as it arises. The pages of the PULPIT have done their share in helping onward the good work.

Now, it was the sarcastic reproach of Roman Catholicism that it gave its followers "too much to swallow, and too little to digest," and naturally, in a state of unwholesome surfeit and superheated imagination, the Bible dropped out of their hands; while they, in turn, would not be rising above the "retort courteous," if they reminded that we, who boast of our possession and active dissemination of the Holy Book, had indeed the words, but that too often we obscured the sense by following the lead of the Fathers, who were children in criticism, and of the Jews, who had none. At any rate, our critics, scientific and literary, see this well enough. Under their guidance new views on many subjects connected with the Bible, or directly arising out of it, are gaining ground. That once-dreaded word, "Neology," has its learned advocates not only in Germany, but in the United States and in England. I would refer to Prof. Driver's Isaiah and to Canon Cheyne's Jeremiah, in the series of "Men of the Bible," as among the latest proofs of my assertion. Your readers should study carefully chap. vii. of the last-named work, headed "Fraud, or Needful Illusion?" to satisfy themselves of the truth of the principle that God employs partial error in instruments of truth; or, as "Presbyter" rightly insists, that "the doctrine is everything, the mode of presentation has no independent value." It appears to me an irrefragable truth that all transition begins with illusion—it matters little whether religious or political; whether a thousand years ago, or at the present day. The glamour of national reconciliation and cemented friendship, which Parliamentary leaders throw round Home Rule for Ireland, is as much an illusion to-day as the grand chapters of the Isaiah of the captivity on the return of his countrymen. To name only the Mosaic law, the Temple, the second Advent, the Antichrist, verbal inspiration, prophecy and its interpretation, demoniacal possession, and witchcraft—what illusions, and of persistent vitality, too, have gathered about them! Why, Sir, it is hard to think of a single subject which is free from illusion. Illusion seems to be a necessity of our very nature. It was needful for the Jews in every reformation, or attempt at reformation, to have the sanction of authority, in the earlier times of Moses, in the later ones of Ezra, and, in a minor degree, of those prophets who commanded their respect. Thus the names of Moses, Isaiah, Zechariah, and Daniel, within the Canon, and of a far larger number outside it, were used without any idea of fraud, in our modern sense, to authorise moral and doctrinal teaching. It was simply the literary habit of the people. To judge them by our standard is monstrous.

It is not, therefore, charging the Book of Jonah with fraud or imposition when critics say that it was written about three centuries after the death of Jonah, the son of Amittai, in post-exilian language, and conveying noble lessons of Jehovah's omnipresence and of His mercy to the penitent, even if heathen, under the guise of a story likely to arrest even thoughtless readers. Here is, so to say, a religious Æsop's fable. Why not relieve our souls, and honestly acknowledge it as such?

F. T. P.

SIR,—Referring to "Presbyter's" letter and mine in this day's PULPIT on the Book of Jonah, I wish to guard myself against being thought to agree with him that the Books of Ruth and Esther are unhistorical. These, unlike Jonah, contain nothing contrary to historical probability. Esther might possibly be a romance, but is, I think, far more like history. Ruth could not be a romance—the romances written by primitive men are ballads or epics, not domestic idyls—and when a more modern style of romance begins to be written the subjects are taken, not from primitive, but from contemporary life; and it is, moreover, scarcely possible that the novelist could attain to that exquisite atmosphere of primitiveness which in Ruth co-exists with the most perfect refinement. Ruth must be the product of the primitive age of which it tells; and, if so, it must be history.

The character of the Book of Job is different from these. Job and his friends may be real persons, but, if so, the Book is related to history only as the works of the Greek tragic dramatists are.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.
Belfast, 2nd March, 1889.

SIR, — Your correspondent, "Presbyter," asks: "What is there in the New Testament to preclude us from maintaining the view, that in all probability the Book of Jonah has the character which independent research has brought us to think of it as having"—viz., "a mere apologue or romantic fiction"? In reply I beg to say, that there it one statement of our Lord's which seems to me to quite preclude such a theory. He says, "the men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonas." Is it not almost incredible that our Lord should speak of the Ninevites in this prophetic manner, and then give the reason why, in the judgment, they shall do so; and at the same time know, be it said with reverence, that the whole history of Jonah was a mere Jewish fable? Were His hearers more likely to be impressed by what He said, if based on fiction rather than on fact? Might they not very

naturally have replied, "Now we know Thou art not a teacher sent from God, for Jonah's history is untrue, a mere fable; the Ninevites never repented, and yet Thou sayest, I, the Son of Man will, like Jonah, be three days in the heart of the earth: and these repentant Ninevites shall condemn us in the judgment?" Why did they not retort on Him in some such manner if they so regarded Jonah's history, and knew that He did also? The answer I leave to those whose acquaintance with modern critical investigations in Old Testament history, no doubt far exceeds mine; merely adding that where such a doctrine as His Resurrection was in question, "literal fact," would, I humbly venture to assume, give greater "point" to His teaching than any "familiar story," even though it be a "divinely inspired apologue."

INQUIRENS.

THE VERY WORDS OF SCRIPTURE GIVEN UP!

SIR,—Allow me to say a few words in reply to Mr. Murphy and "Presbyter" in your present number.

1. Mr. Murphy does not believe that our Lord spoke, as recorded, of Jonah. This gets rid of all difficulty, and of the Gospels too. This is cutting the Gordian knot with a vengeance. So I take leave of him, as he does of the Gospels.

2. I now turn to "Presbyter." He says we need not judge of the Old Testament by what is said of it in the New. This is nearly as bad as Mr. Murphy.

3. The story of Jonah is incredible! Is it more incredible than God's creating everything out of nothing? He who swallows one need not make wry faces at the other. He says it is incredible that a heathen king should repent at the preaching of "an unknown foreign infidel." How, then, were the nations converted by the Apostles?

4. "Presbyter" gives up every book that he does not like—Esther and Ruth to wit. He sneers at the Rock following the Israelites, as if he had never heard of the theory that what followed them was the water. Could not God do this as easily as bring it out of the Rock? He ridicules what St. Jude says about the body of Moses. In fact he believes nothing that offends his judgment as to what God ought or ought not to do.

5. It is vain telling us that the Rabbis loved parables. Why, we know that our Lord Himself did so. But we are not talking of *that*. What we are talking of is His mixing up the language of history with that of parables. His mixing up parables with actual histories, as of Solomon; nay, His mixing up, as of equal value, parables with His prophecy of His entombment and resurrection; and, in fact, making the subsequent accounts of those events of as little value as fables about Jonah and the whale.

6. The whole Bible, as a revelation, is at stake. Nothing is to be of any value now but what pleases Mr. Murphy, "Presbyter," and the German theologians.

7. The language of "Presbyter" in reference to what he has not disproved to be divinely inspired is so irreverent, that one is ashamed to repeat it. "Machinery of a grotesque kind," "connected with some ancient *solar* myth," whatever that may be; the miracles are "so out of proportion to their motives," as if we could gauge the Almighty's motives! He scoffs at the idea that "to our Lord's human mind our modern critical questions could be present." But the whole letter is one of an open infidel, who fritters away all that is miraculous with the idea of recommending the worthless residuum to the minds of those who will only believe what they please,

C.C., V.G.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Atherton, Rev. C. J., Rector of Farringdon; Canon of Exeter Cathedral.

Bayne, Rev. Ronald, M.A., Rector of Orlestone, Kent.

Browne, Rev. Stephen S., B.A., Chaplain to Pembroke Dockyard.

Carus-Wilson, Rev. W., B.A., Rector of Lyndon, Oakham; Curate of Kilndown, Staplehurst.

Dalison, Rev. Roger W. H., M.A. Oxon, late Curate of Stone, Greenhithe; Rector of Swyre, Dorchester.

Guest, Rev. Thomas Hill, Vicar of St. Mark's, Hulme; Vicar of Poulton-le-Fylde, near Blackpool.

Hale, Rev. George, M.A., Rector of Swanscombe, Kent.

Healy, Rev. Wynn, Succentor; Precentor of Leeds Parish Church.

Heany, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Hull.

Jones, Rev. Richard, Rector of Llanfrothen, Merionethshire; Rector of Bodfean, South Carnarvonshire.

Lloyd, Rev. Jorwerth Grey, M.A., Rector of Bosherston; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Pembrokeshire, Captain Higgan, R.A.

M'Kenzie, Rev. H. W., M.A., Assistant-Master of Wellington College; Head Master of Lancing College.

Millett, Rev. Hamlet W., Chaplain to the *Northampton*.

Neville, Rev. Frederic William Cecil, B.A., Vicar of Frickley, Doncaster.

Newell, Rev. C. F., Rector of Chiselborough; Rural Dean of the Rural Deanery of Martock.

Parrett, Rev. Frederick, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Walsall: Rector of St. Anne's, Haughton, Lancashire.

Seymour, Rev. A. E., Vicar of Bromsgrove; Surrogate.

South, Rev. Edward Wilton, M.A., Head Master of Blackheath Proprietory School; Vicar of Sedbergh, Yorkshire.

Thornton, Rev. Herbert Parry, B.A., Vicar of Normanton.

Wilberforce, Rev. W. F., Vicar of Fulford; Vicar of Brodsworth, Yorkshire.

Wilkinson, Rev. W. B., M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Birmingham; Surrogate.

Wolstencroft, Rev. Edward Mansergh, Perpetual Curate of St. Simon's, South Shields.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bolland, Rev. Arthur, M.A., of Magdalene College, Cambridge, and formerly Vicar of St. Thomas's, Leeds, at 12, St. Mary's Terrace, Scarborough, on Ash Wednesday, the 6th inst., in his 60th year.

Dalton, Rev. Thomas, B.D., Hon. Canon of Carlisle, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Whitehaven, and for forty years Rural Dean, at Whitehaven, on the 9th inst., aged 83.

Evans, Rev. John, M.A., of Christ Church, Oxford, forty-five years Vicar of Whixall, at Whixall Vicarage, Shropshire, on the 7th inst., aged 92.

Gwilt, Rev. Robert, at Icklingham Rectory, on the 5th inst., aged 77.

Lambe, Rev. George, M.A., Cantab, at Highlands, Ivybridge, on the 8th inst., aged 61.

Payne, Rev. Randolph, eldest son of the late Randolph Payne, Esq., of 7, Norfolk Terrace, Brighton, and St. James' Street, London, at 7, Norfolk Terrace, Brighton, on the 9th inst., aged 74.

The Church of England Pulpit.

ST. PAUL'S CHARGE.

By the Rev. THOMAS JORDAN, D.D., Rector of Magherafelt, Co. Derry.

An Ordination Sermon Preached in Armagh Cathedral, on Sunday, February 10th, 1889.

"Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season.'—2 Tim. iv. 2.

ST. PAUL had long been so. With him our Lord and Saviour had been "all and in all." As preaching the word and the Saviour to whom the word leads, St. Paul had held a high office. He is an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God; "he is ordained a preacher and an apostle" (1 Tim. ii. 7). "The glorious Gospel of the blessed God was committed to his trust" (1 Tim. i. 11).

In this high office he has been the leader of a great movement for thirty years. He has won many souls for Christ. He has planted churches in the towns all round the Mediterranean; in Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, Corinth and Rome. Now the great labourer is near the end. The standard is falling from the arm of "Paul the aged." When the standard-bearer falls another is to be raised up—"a soldier is to step at once into the place in which he has seen his comradef all."* He has left us a more lasting monument than the brass or the marble in the two pastoral Epistles to Timothy, and in the Epistle to Titus on the continuance of the ministry.

I. In handing on his torch of light, the Apostle says: "This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to the prophecies that went before on thee that thou mightest war a good warfare" (1 Tim. i. 18).

The torch of light, put into Timothy's hand, was in its turn to be passed on to others. In passing it on there is the solemn exhortation, in tones of overpowering earnestness: "Thou therefore, my son, be strong in the grace which is in Christ Jesus. And the things that thou hast heard of me, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii. 1, 2). In his pastoral Epistle to Titus his word on the continuance of the ministry is, "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city" (Tit. i. 5).

A prisoner in Rome, for the second time, in sight of the martyr's grave being dug for him, the Apostle gives, amid these dark shadows, the same solemn charge to Timothy at Ephesus, and to Titus at Crete, for the carrying on the ministry of the Gospel.

There was a good deal of difference between the great city of Ephesus, with its world-famed idolatry of the heathen goddess Diana, with its culture, progress, and learning, as a famous town of the old world, and the half-civilized mountaineers of Crete; and yet the arrangement is the same threefold ministry in each place. Standing on these scriptural lines we send out, amid our labours and our prayers, our missions to India, with its old civilization and culture in a threefold ministry, as we do also to the barbarous tribes of dark Africa.

The Apostle, looking to heaven, where his pardon was sealed through Christ, labouring in prayer for his converts, is very much concerned for the little flocks he has gathered here and there. He is labouring for them that there may be no confusion in the ministry after he has sunk into the martyr's grave.

Contrary to what the Plymouth brethren teach, the Apostle in his dying words not only provides for the continuance of the Gospel ministry, but he gives us a long list of qualifications for ministers. He tells us to whom we are to pass the torch of light and truth.

II. What are the qualifications for the ministry? The office-bearers of the Church are to be of a Christian mind and heart, moved by the Holy Ghost. Timothy is to preach the word, to do the work of an evangelist, to be instant in season, out of season, to make full proof of his ministry. Titus is to "speak the things which become sound doctrine" (Tit. ii. 1). Timothy is to give himself to reading. Following these St. Bernard gives us the sound advice—"Seek not to pour out before thou art thyself full." *

What are the Christian graces to be found in the office-bearers of the Christian Church? They are purity, sobriety, patience, generosity, enduring hardness—all these graces of life, such as time tries. No one can say these are things of feeling or emotion, the growth of a day. These Christian virtues are no hot-house plants, quickly reared by artificial heat. They each and all spring from a patient continuance in well-doing.

The very centre of Christian life is touched, for Timothy is to follow all these graces of the Christian life, "with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart" (2 Tim. ii. 22).

It is a good rule of the fourth Council of Carthage: "Qui sancti non sunt, sancta tractare non debent;" and it is in the spirit of the Scripture, for Timothy is to be an example of the believers, and Titus is to be a pattern of good works.

It is not easy to see why these qualifications of

* Bishop Selwyn's Sermon at consecration of Bishop Patteson, A.D. 1861.

* Quoted by Right Rev. W. W. How, Bishop of Wakefield, in Lectures on Pastoral Work.

head and heart are laid down for ministers if there are to be no ministers, as some at present most erroneously teach. Very heartily do we thank God for the light held up to us by the dying hand of the Apostle, and very humbly and very prayerfully, amid our own prayers and yours, we walk this day in its leading.

III. The pastor in the time of the Apostle needed all these qualities. Many and great were his difficulties, as we see from these epistles. The pastor still needs these qualities. To preach the word, to be the pastor in schools, Bible-classes, the sick-room, to be the pattern of every Christian grace among rich and poor, who is sufficient for these things? What are we that we should have power to carry on the Lord's work! "Ars est artium regimen animarum," says Gregory the Great, as quoted by Bishop How, in his address to divinity students at Cambridge.

A wise rule of the Apostle is, that in striving with difficulties we are to strive lawfully. The Christian soldier in his armour is to have his loins girt about with "truth." It will help us through many a difficulty to keep always within the plain rules of moderation, good sense, honour, honesty, and truth. Rules these ever observed by the Apostle, though looking to higher help: "I can do all things through Christ Jesus, which strengtheneth me."

Difficulties have been ever round the pastor. Who can expect to be without them in our Disestablished Church? So has it ever been. I find that Bishop Butler, in a charge to the clergy of Durham, A.D. 1751, refers to the "present turn of the age as a wonderful frugality in everything that had regard to religion and extravagance in everything else." Though a hundred and thirty-eight years have passed, you would think he was speaking of the present age and in our Disestablished Church. In that same charge I find he goes forty years back from his own time to another chief pastor addressing his clergy in exactly the same spirit. What do I prove from this? That the work of our Blessed Lord has always been done in the world amid difficulties and troubles. The picture, however, has another side. We ought to look at how very much has been done in our poor country since the support of the Church has been thrown upon us. No fair man can say but that very much has been done. Very much is due to many whose hearts God has touched, and who have largely helped our Scriptural Church. In many ways our God has been better to us than our fears. The dark cloud has passed away and the evil we feared has not come. Looking at this side of the picture we thank God and take courage.

IV. We are receiving new helpers to-day—new labourers in our Church—to be a strength and a blessing to our people. They trust, and we trust also, that they are moved by the Holy Ghost to undertake this work. Very earnest have been our prayers for them, for the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Ghost on them. "We pray for them that they may stir up the gift of God that is in them by the putting on of hands" (2 Tim. i. 6). Their own prayer will be that the risen head of the Church may send down on them His gifts for men, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry."

Our Scriptural Church is a minority in our beloved country. So was the Church of Timothy in Ephesus, so was the Church of Titus in Crete, so were the Churches of St. Paul in the various districts of Europe and Asia where he had gathered his little flocks. In all these places the Church was a blessing to the whole land. The elements of our population are greatly mixed in this land of ours. The warp and woof of social life are so wrought into each other in the web, that we do in a measure act on the whole country. We are to be a blessing first to our own people, and then—for the minority is constantly crossing the majority—to others.

Our Church and her ministers—leading our people to holy living and to holy dying through Jesus Church—must be a blessing. Making holy families more numerous among us, bringing in quietness, peace, and love among all Christians, this must be the truest patriotism and the greatest blessing. Labouring in our own little corner perhaps, spending and being spent for our own little flock, our hearts sympathy and our labour, as far as can be, will go out beyond these limits, the leaven spreading more into the lump; doing, perhaps by the love of Jesus, as ministers of His Gospel, what the law has not done, what the statesman has not been able to bring about, this is to lead our loved people towards the blessed end: "Righteousness exalteth a nation." From remote places, where we are trying to keep our scriptural light from being put out, as well as from more favoured districts, the prayer and the labour of the minister will be that God may be pleased to set up the fruits of the Spirit in the land, "love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." From all our districts the prayer will go up, as Paul ministering to the minority prayed for Israel that they might be saved, for blessings, wider, ever wider, on our land; for our countrymen that they may be more Bible-loving, more God-fearing, more people of prayer.

Thus will the minister of the Gospel be the truest friend of his country. Our land will have no worker doing so much good. More than two centuries ago I find that Dr. Barrow, in times of great disturbance in both Church and State, on an occasion somewhat like the present, urges that no man can be better for the country than the good minister of the Gospel. The good of the state must be "advanced by the sincere instruction of people in obedience, justice, fidelity, and in the

keeping of a good conscience." Where, then, can you find one doing more for the country than the good minister of the Gospel?* This is as true now as it was then. It is the greatest blessing to the land, the whole country, when the work of the ministry is worthily and earnestly done. Great is the work to which the ministers of the Gospel are called. They are the servants of the Lord; they are to be "gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient" (2 Tim. ii. 24). They are "ambassadors for Christ," as "though God did beseech you by us," treating of peace between earth and heaven, between man and God, and between man and man. They are stewards in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God. They are watchmen, bound to be ever wakeful, ever attentive, "ready"—to use the words of Dr. Isaac Barrow—"to warn the people of coming dangers." They are shepherds bound to be out in all weathers, in every sort of spiritual labour; they are to feed the flock, guide, guard them; they are to seek for the lost, and to go after those that stray.

In this spirit Paul had pursued his great work—the friend of all, lifting all out of sin through Jesus Christ, raising all to virtue and godliness of life. Timothy and Titus, and the elders ordained by them in every city, were to carry forward Christian life among all. The word was—as they gathered men to Christ—let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity. Winning souls to Christ, their converts were to be taught to "maintain good works" (Tit. i ii. 14). So are the ministers of the Gospel still to be. Pursuing this work amid difficulties and trials, whatever they may be, the minister of the Gospel often thinks of the great words of the Apostle: "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand; I have fought a good fight;" words these that have roused the courage of many a martyr, and made many a weary and heavy laden Christian take heart again.

We ask you for your prayers for the ministers of our Church, that they may be a blessing to all our people. History tells us of the missionary of our country, St. Patrick;—A.D. 450 to 493—preparing, amid many difficulties, to appear at the royal court of Tarah and to preach the Gospel before the king and court; laying great stress on prayer.

Setting out on his dangerous journey to win souls, his prayer was his armour (lorica):—

> Christ with me, Christ before me,
> Christ behind me, Christ within me.

And in the same spirit the great missionary continued:—

> Christ in the heart of every one who thinks of me,
> Christ in the mouth of every man that speaks to me,
> Christ in every eye that sees me,
> Christ in every ear that hears me.†

* A consecration sermon by Dr. Isaac Barrow, Henry the Seventh Chapel, July 4th, 1663, at the Bishop of Man's Consecration.

† Todd's "Life of St. Patrick," p. 426.

The prayer is very good and earnest in a time of great difficulty. In that spirit you have prayed here to-day for the ministers of our Church that our blessed Lord may ever be with them and with those whom they meet, that He may help the preacher, "speed the foot and touch the tongue," that He may ever go before them, and go with them, and that He may fulfil to each one His promise, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

"CHRIST BEARING OUR SINS."

A Sermon by the Rev. HAMILTON STUART VERSCHOYLE, M.A.

"That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses."—St. Matt. viii. 17.

"Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness, by whose stripes ye were healed."—2 St. Peter ii. 24.

THE work of our Blessed Lord on earth for us is constantly spoken of in the New Testament under the figure of purchase, ransom, redemption, and closely connected with this is the figure, or rather the awful reality of which bodily slavery is but the faint image, of the slavery of sin, from which he came to deliver us. Till near the end of the second century of the Christian era, Christian thinkers and writers seem to have rested content with the great truth which is expressed by this figure, viz., that the Lord Jesus Christ came to deliver us from sin by the sacrifice of Himself, and did not press the figure, nor ask the question, "To whom was the ransom paid?"

Then arose St. Irenæus, and, early in the next century, Origen, who pressed the metaphor and definitely asked this question, and answered that the price was paid to the Devil.

For about eight hundred years, this answer seems to have satisfied all who asked the question, and then in the eleventh century St. Anselm, asking the same question, replied that the price was paid to God the Father, and that it consisted in the obedience of Christ, more especially as that obedience was manifested in His sufferings and death. This is the theory which theologians call the theory of "active, vicarious satisfaction." Then in the 13th century, Pope Innocent III., the first promulgator of transubstantiation, first promulgated the theory known by theologians as that of "passive vicarious satisfaction"—the theory which regards the sufferings and death of Christ as being in themselves a satisfaction to God. Doubtless, there are to be found in writers perceding Innocent III., and St. Anselm, and, perhaps even in those preceding St. Irenæus, passages on which such an interpretation can be put by pressing their words into a strictly literal sense; but so there can be found in their writings, passages by which from a similar

process the teaching of transubstantiation, or even the change of the water in Baptism into blood, can be extracted.

Each of these theories has been held by men who were not only thoughtful and learned, but saintly and devout. I do not purpose to enter into any discussion of the merits or demerits of these theories, but rather to endeavour to show that the two verses which I have chosen for my text, in the light which one throws on the other, lead us towards the greater "simplicity of the gospel" which was held in the early Church.

Far be it from me to assert that any theory, simple or complex, can exhaust the fulness of our Lord's work—there are depths beyond depths in it which no human mind can fathom, but they are depths of holiness and love, depths of light and not of darkness. To accept as part of our Lord's work anything which contains no light for us is so far to rob it of its character, of gospel, or good news, while to accept as part of it anything which is contrary to the light which He has given us within, is so far to make it the reverse of a gospel. The two verses which I have chosen for my text are both quotations from the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, and declarations of the fulfilment of that prophecy. But one seems to regard the prophecy as fulfilled in our Lord's healing work, while the other regards it as fulfilled in His redemptive work. Were this some important question we might admit that one or other of the Apostles was mistaken in his interpretation, but we cannot admit this in such a matter as the nature of their Lord's work. Nor can we, without making an end of all rational interpretation of Holy Scripture, admit that a prophecy can have two totally different interpretations.

I think, if we look more closely into these two passages, we shall find that, as is so often the case with apparent inconsistencies in the Bible, the apparent inconsistency, but serves to give as a fuller insight into the truth which is taught by both of them.

Let us begin with considering the passage which gives the more outward application of the prophecy. The words preceding follow upon the description of a day of sustained activity in His Father's work, such as we may regard as typical of all the days of His earth ministry. "They brought unto Him many that were possessed with Devils: and He cast out the spirits with His word, and healed all that were sick." And then St. Matthew, as was so frequently his wont, quotes the prophecy which found its fulfilment in what he had been relating. "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet saying, Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." Now we have no reason to believe that our Lord was Himself ill with the diseases of those who came to Him for healing, and it is, of course, utterly impossible to suppose that He had that terrible disease possession with Devils, and thus the prophecy did not receive a literal outward fulfilment; but it received then a fulfilment no less real, but rather more real, because inward and spiritual. Think how, even to any of us, with our imperfect affections, the sorrows and sufferings of those who are dear to us, bound to us by the ties of kindred or friendship, are felt as much or more than our own sorrows or sufferings. And He was the friend of all, He, the Son of Man, was bound by kindred to all, all were dear to Him.

Think then, what suffering it must have been to His heart, so full of love and compassion, to witness the suffering of those who came to Him; how fully he must have suffered with the suffering of those His brethren, and then it will appear how fully He fulfilled the prophecy, how fully "He took their infirmities and bare their sicknesses."

And now, if we pass to the passage from St. Peter, we shall see what light is thrown upon it by this passage from St. Matthew.

If the bodily suffering of His brethren, the bodily evil which had befallen them, was felt by Him as His own suffering and caused Him suffering, think what it must have been to His spotless soul, full as it was of love and compassion, to witness the spiritual evil sin, not which had befallen men (for sin can befall no one), but of which men were guilty. Think what it must have been to Him; in Gethsemane in anticipation, and on Calvary in actuality, to be brought face to face with the sin of mankind, His brethren in its most awful form, as enmity to the Perfect Holiness.

Even to a holy man or woman it is a suffering to realise the sin of their brethren; and if this be so with imperfect human beings, what must have been the sufferings of Him, the Lamb of God, without spot, what must have been His agony? This accounts for the "agony and bloody sweat" in Gethsemane; for the great and bitter cry on Calvary; this is why He was "a man of sorrows"—the holy Son of God could not become incarnate in this world of sin, and not be a man of sorrows, not suffer beyond all human conception. Then, when at last His suffering reached its climax on Calvary, His human frame could not bear it longer, and He died of a broken heart. We see then how fully He "His own self bare our sins in His own body" (in His incarnate nature) through His life and "on to the tree."

His sufferings then become not merely an indirect revelation of His love, as making Him willing to bear such sufferings for us, but a direct revelation of it; for it was only infinite love which could have so sympathised with mankind, as to realise the evil of their state as if it were His own. And thus, too, are His sufferings a direct revelation of His righteousness, His holiness; for it was only the perfect righteousness, the perfect holiness, which could have felt sin to be such an agony. Stern condemnation of sin, fearful threatening of punishment against sinners, are a natural result of true holiness and true love; but they

might come from some other source; but to feel sin to be an agony, that can only come from holiness and love. Thus, the cross of Christ is to us the highest revelation of the holiness and the love of God; for He who there suffered is one with the Father. As the sainted McLeod Campbell said, "We should look upon the sufferings of Christ, not as the measure of what God can inflict, but as the revelation of what God feels." And thus, He makes atonement; for by this revelation He draws us away from sin and self to God, and reconciles, at once, us to Him.

The light which the passage in St. Matthew throws upon that in St. Peter, it also throws on the context of the latter. "Christ suffered for us: leaving us an example that ye should follow His steps." We see how we can seek to follow Him in that "He did no sin"; in that "When He was reviled He reviled not again"; but, if the "bearing of our sins in His own body on to the tree," were some mysterious bearing of the Father's wrath, or some work of which we can form no conception in the slightest degree, then we could not in this seek to follow His steps. But, when we realise that suffering to have been the realisation of our sins, and to have flowed directly from His holiness and love, then we see how the more we partake of His spirit, the more our hearts become purified, our love deepened, our sympathy widened, the more we shall feel our own sins and those of our brethren to be a suffering to us.

Those suffering ones who came to the Lord to be healed needed not His revelation to show them how sore their diseases were; but we, sick with the disease of sin, need to look upon His revelation of holiness and love that we may realise our disease of sin and selfishness.

Oh! let us look upon Him as He hung upon the cross, revealing to us the eternal suffering our sin is to God our Father, revealing to us that Father's perfect holiness and infinite love. "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by? Behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto My sorrow?"

Can we resist the drawing of that love and holiness; can we continue to live to self, which is to live to sin, when we reflect each one of us: "My sins are part of what broke His heart?" Can we resist a love which has been ours from all eternity —which will never forsake us for all eternity? Shame on us if we make the greatness, the unweariedness, of that love an occasion for continuing to resist it, Oh! let us yield to His drawing and embrace Him as our Saviour from sin, and in the power of His risen life live to Him here, that we may live to Him more fully, more perfectly, throughout the ages of eternity.

CANON RICHARD HARVEY, of Gloucester, celebrated his ninety-first birthday on Thursday week, having been born on March 14, 1798. The venerable Canon still attends the services in the cathedral.

PAMPHLET and Advice FREE

Every man and woman in search of HEALTH should write without delay to Mr. C. B. HARNESS, *Consulting Medical Electrician* (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his *New Medical Work*, entitled "Harness' Guide to Health," which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of Harness' Electropathic Belt and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper.

MR. C. B. HARNESS also gives Advice Free of charge (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 23, 1889.

AFRICAN BARBARITY.

SOME ten years have pased away since that estimable philanthropist, the late Joseph Cooper, of Walthamstow, published a work entitled "The Dark Continent," in which he implored his fellow-Christians to direct their thoughts and efforts to the suppression of the barbarities which, for a long period, had been converting vast regions of Central and Eastern Africa into scenes of the most shocking cruelty and desolation. Mr. Cooper's work was not altogether fruitless in its results. It awakened some serious reflection and inquiry, and its pleadings are still remembered by some of the readers of its painfully interesting pages.

But during the years that have intervened, the evils depicted by Mr. Cooper have not only continued, but have frightfully increased in their extent. A very recent traveller in the "Dark Continent," Mr. Henry Drummond, the well-known author of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," has issued, under the title of "Tropical Africa," his own impressions of what he there witnessed and ascertained.

One of the maps in Mr. Drummond's book shows that the African Continent is not only scored across, almost from ocean to ocean, with the desolating tracks of the negro-hunting and negro-butchering Mahommedans, but that there are now large regions which, within a few years, have been entirely depopulated by these fiends in human shape, the swarthy Arabs of the desert, the savage followers of the cruel False Prophet.

These wretches come in large bands, armed with guns, swords, and instruments of torture, seize upon

the harmless negroes, shoot down any who resist, and carry off the population of villages and towns by wholesale. By means of manacles, chains, ropes, and heavy bars of wood or iron, they secure their poor captives, and then drive them forwards on their long journey of hundreds or thousands of miles, towards the distant sea-coast, in order that the few survivors, who then remain, may be sold into Egypt, Turkey, Arabia, or other parts of the Mahommedan world, chiefly for harem-service.

Commander V. L. Cameron and Cardinal Lavigerie assert that two million negroes are kidnapped by the Arabs every year, and that within a brief period at least ten millions have been killed or starved on the journeys to the coast. An eye-witness also states that for every negro who finally reaches the harems of Cairo, Alexandria, and Constantinople, *two hundred* others have perished on the way.

Now the practical question which arises, in view of these terrible and vastly extensive massacres, is —What can be done to stop them? And, as might be expected, various replies are given.

First, some good Christians and sincere philanthropists, including, for example, Mr. Henry Drummond, and other members of the Anti-Slavery Party, advocate the continuous employment of British or other European gunboats off the coasts of East Africa, and the maintenance of a military police, also by the European Powers, at certain points of the interior.

Secondly, other persons cry out for a more wholesale military and naval action. But what has been the result, hitherto, of all the resorts to force, on the coasts and deserts of Africa, on the part of Europeans? England alone has spent many millions of money, and many thousands of lives, in recent wars in Egypt, the Soudan, and Abyssinia. Germany, too, has begun to bombard Africans on their own shores. But, meanwhile, the slave-stealing expeditions and massacres have gone on increasing.

Thirdly, there is another and a far more promising mode of procedure—by the exertion of religious, moral, and commercial influences. These may be essayed in various directions.

One of the means proposed would be the assembling of a Conference of the European Powers, to devise some concerted and sustained pressure upon the Turkish, Egyptian, and other authorities. But it may be confessed that the difficulties of gathering such a Conference, and, still more, of securing the carrying out of its wishes in satisfactory and united action, would be very great.

Much more available would be a resort to greatly increased educational and missionary influences amongst the Mahommedans, together with efforts for the development of railroads and general commerce. The appointment, also by European Powers, of agents of the stamp of General Gordon, Mr. Wylde, Sir Charles Warren, and others, would be of use, as distinguished from mere routine officials, the representatives of greedy bondholders and the favourites of selfish political partisans. By such pacific and persuasive means, some effectual progress, either directly or indirectly, may be gradually made in the reform and restraint of those pernicious customs and habits, which are the source of so much of the miseries of modern African slave-trading.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Third Sunday in Lent.

Through Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, there runs this week one leading idea—that of sincerity. And first, *in the Collect* we notice this in the wording of the prayer "look upon the *hearty* desires." How many of our prayers fail for want of this deep earnest reality, God only knows. Would it not be well for us this Lent to examine ourselves on this point? To find out whether we are always clear as to *meaning* what we ask in our daily private devotions; whether we do indeed *pray* our part, in the worship which we share in public with our fellow-Christians. Surely we shall all find ourselves to be verily guilty in this thing: let us endeavour to amend.

Then, in the second place, if we look carefully at the Epistle we shall see the same truth taught there. We are first exhorted to be "followers of God as dear childeen," and then the writer goes on to speak of the fruits of a life which is a sincere and definite endeavour to copy the Pattern Life of our Saviour. We all know sometimes to our cost, how clear and exact is the imitative power of children. What a complete and unmistakeable representation of the doings of their elders, they accomplish; even so should we, by the grace of God, show in our lives so perfect an imitation of the ways of God, that the world around should see clearly "whose we are and whom we serve."

And again, in the third place, we have taught us in the Gospel the great need for sincerity and definiteness in our *beliefs*. If we should desire earnestly that no lukewarmness creep into our *prayers*; if we rightly judge that, we must use strenuous efforts to let our *actions* reflect the teaching of Christ; is it not even more important, if one may say so, that our *faith* should be true? In these times, when more than ever, perhaps, people are inclined to think any belief will do, we need to be very watchful and very prayerful in this matter, remembering that "he that is not *with* Me is against Me" We need to examine our title-deeds, to be ready to give a reason for the hope which we hold. Let us try to make such use of our privileges that our prayers — our faith — our doings shall all be to the Glory of God.

Children's Scrap-Book Missions.—The Secretary makes his usual annual appear for old Christmas and New Year's cards. Over one hundred thousand have now been received, and made into 22,500 scrap books, etc. For particulars, apply to 27, Benedict Road, Stockwell, London, S.W.

RELIGIOUS ANIMOSITY.

By W. WALTERS, Esq., B.A., London.

(*Continued from page* 130.)

Who would not prefer "Hymns, Ancient and Modern" to the mixed medley of collections previously in use, or the "New Version" of Brady and Tate?

Still more to its credit is it that the poor have been cared for, and a blow struck at that division of classes in the public worship which is foreign to the spirit of Christian worship. The prayers are no longer read to the people, and the responding carried on in a sort of dialogue between priest and clerk; but in most cases the face of him who is interceding on behalf of the people is turned away from them. The preacher has come down from his lofty position, and takes a more humble place, befitting a fellow-Christian and fellow-sinner, whose business it is not to command, but to entreat and exhort. Once more it may be laid to the credit of the High Churchman that he seeks to explain Christian doctrine and ritual, and does, so far as his views go, instil a much better knowledge of what the Christian faith is than was ever thought of formerly. The movement has drawn together a number of young men; it has interested them by its choir practices, its gatherings, its guilds. For all these the Catholic revival deserves praise.

Yet such praise can only be partial. The system is not after all one that adapts itself to the age; the fatal evil is that it is retrogressive. That alone is sufficient to prevent its final success. The whole tenour of its way, the entire tendency of its teaching and practice, is not one of advancement. It lives in the past. Its buildings are copies. Its vestments are the cast-off clothes of a former civilisation. Its stained windows are imitations of mediæval art. Its painting is stiff and conventional, a reproduction of the imperfect drawing of the early century. Its chant is the rude Gregorian, in the imperfect notation of the monks. It looks back with loving fondness on the Old Latin, and longs for the day to come when its services shall be again performed in the tongue of the learned. In everything we see a desire to carry civilisation backward. The sexes must be separated during worship. The gate must shut out the higher caste of the choir from the inferior multitude; the priest must revert to the costume of pre-Reformation times. Its religious orders must again go back to the distinctions of dress, which are fast becoming everywhere abolished. All is a copy. Even in the small matter of spelling, its texts must revert to an imperfect stage of the alphabet, when V was not properly distinguished from U, nor I from J. Its letters are ornamental, but nothing new can be devised: the strange and illegible mediæval character is resorted to. Even a numeral must have the antiquated J for the last stroke in the numbers VII. and VIII. Although better knowledge has exploded fable; it still displays the pelican wounding her breast by way of emblem. Modern English Catholicism is unmindful of the fact that those ages which it copies proceeded on a very different principle themselves. Far from looking back, they made use of all those inventions which were then the most recent, and their art, rude as it was, was the highest and most progressive known at that era by a half-barbarous people.

But the style of worship developed of late years, through being a copy only of the past, is often entirely wanting in purpose. A rite is adopted for the sole reason that at a former period it was customary. It is a complaint of High Church journals themselves that there is no regular system of ritual in their churches. Every congregation has a different one, and that one always eclectic, borrowed from East and West, or mediæval England indiscriminately. Let us be well assured that the ceremonies of the Ancient Church, strange as some of them were, had not only their significancy, but their utility. They arose out of the then state of things, were not introduced from a foreign source, but were the spontaneous growth of circumstances. When these were altered, the usage was still kept up, and in time, when the reason of the custom had faded away from men's minds, a symbolism was invented which never had place in the thoughts of antiquity.

Some of the recent innovations are borrowed from comparatively late usages. The short cape-like surplice and the re-table are cases in point. On the other hand, a few things condemned as Puritanised or due to Continental influence, such as the reading of the Decalogue at the communion and kneeling at the Gloria in Excelsis, have good precedents in olden times.

Yet, further, an excessive veneration for the past has led to the revival of some social arrangements, which experience long ago proved to be injurious to the well-being of the community. Would it not be a serious injury to society if the many religious orders of earlier days were again to flourish here? Has it not been shown what an evil was the accumulation of large estates in the hands of unproductive recluses? What a loss it was to the happy progress of society that so many of the best of the race were drawn away from the social circle, where their softening and elevating influence was so wanted, and whilst ordinary life was thus left untempered by the example of the good and gentle, those who might have adorned and sanctified it were shut up in gloomy and guarded retreats, when their piety dwindled into ascetism, and their virtues were wasted on the desert air.

The superior usefulness of a celibate clergy is gradually being urged; soon the superior sanctity will be put forward. Now, if any one thing was specially disliked in the mediæval system, it was an unmarried priesthood. The old writers are at one in pointing to this as the grave source of corruption. What a mistake to seek its re-establishment! Confession, such as the Prayer-book suggests, is good as an extraordinary means of help, confession, as it exists in a Roman Catholic country, is surely not to be desired. Coupled with the system of enforced celibacy amongst the priesthood, its evil effects are manifest. Even under favourable conditions, the existence of an inquisitorial power, entering into every house, reaching every heart and opening or closing, as it were, the way to divine forgiveness, is a baneful thing.

For three centuries the Blessed Mother of our Lord may have been insufficiently honoured by Englishmen; but the tide is going in favour of that quasi-divine adoration which mars Romanist books of devotion. Sermons may be heard teaching little less than the Mariolatry of Papal theologians, and the Virgin and Child begin again to figure amongst the ornaments of our churches. Indeed, the hankering after images is far too evident. The Cross is supplanted by the Rood, the Rood becomes the Crucifix. That was so long ago; it is the order of development. With the crucifix and Our Lady's image, we, at last, combine the statues of the whole Hagiology.

The High Church movement boasts that it had its origin in learning, its end is the revival of truths which were being forgotten, its result the establishment of orderly and beautiful worship. Why not stop there? When so much has been effected that is good, churches no longer parted off to hold a fire-engine, ruinous buildings changed to neat temples of God, belfries cleared of tipsy ringers, God's acre converted from a disorderly graveyard to a comely resting-place for those who sleep, the doctrines of the Church duly taught and the sacraments reverently administered—why by extravagance bring discredit on all this? Those styled Puritan are but half won; they may be totally alienated.

There are men who will put the Blessed Virgin in the foremost place of mediation, who invoke the saints, who long for an image in sight when they pray, who take the most corporeal view of the Holy Sacrament. There are those to whom every corrupt teaching of the Middle Ages is sound doctrine. These speak of the good Queen Mary; they call upon St. Thomas of Canterbury to aid in the conversion of England; they long to prostrate themselves before the Holy Father. Will these in the end carry the day? Whatever may be the issue, let us meet it without violence, without bitterness. One possibility is that the world may finally arrange into two groups—all the controversial and negative elements resolving into pure atheism, all believers finding safety against the common foe by rallying round some form of Catholicism.

In presence of a fierce intolerant negation, which would despise whatsoever things are pure, small would appear the differences between any members of Christ's Church. If this be a sad prospect, one more gloomy is still that of a Church ever more and more dividing till Christendom breaks up into a mass of sects, parted by difference, infinitely small but maintained with infinite diligence. One more vision is before us. Some have anticipated that the future Church shall be neither Petrine nor Pauline, but that of St. John, that Christians seeing the limits of knowledge and the impossibility of arriving at absolute truth, will at length no longer "agree to differ," but cease their differences. When the Catholic has learned to respect the spirit of inquiry, when the Protestant sees the benefit of unity, when the Dissenter is ashamed of the false analogy about different regiments marching under the same King, when the Biblical critic shall be a man of faith, and when the sacred Scriptures shall be studied, fairly yet reverently, with the aid of all the light given by Science, by History, by ancient monuments and primeval tradition—studied, that is, as they have never yet been—then shall the prayer of our Great Head be realised, "that they all may be One."

Will such a time ever come to this earth, so marred with strife and confusion? We might well say, never, had we not been taught to pray, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

THE special Examination for the Degree of B.D. at Durham, to which we gave a hearty welcome a year or two ago, is to be repeated this June. The Examiners will be Dr. Ince, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford; Dr. Sanday, Ireland Professor of Exegesis at Oxford; and Rev. J. T. Fowler, Lecturer in Hebrew at Durham. The examination begins on Tuesday, June 18, at 9 a.m. Names, fees, and testimonials should be sent to the Senior Proctor on or before May 18.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS." By F. Rendall, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1888.

MR. RENDALL'S book on the Hebrews contains an excellent summary of the Epistle, a translation, and two essays. It is an unambitious book, making no display of scholarship, and contains no new coined adjectives or monstrous epithets, but we have seldom read one which has more real instruction in less compass. The summary is good; the translation excellent, forcible, and faithful, yet not a mere crib; and the two essays—on the theology of the Epistle and on the sacrificial language of the New Testament—full of information.

No commonplace of theology is more commonplaced than the *dictum* that the Epistle to the Hebrews is Pauline, but not St. Paul's. And those who are tied and bound in the chains of merely phraseological criticism, lay great stress on the plausible argument of similarity in use of words. Long lists of "L., P., H." words are made, and of words used in the same, and often in a special, sense by St. Luke, St. Paul, and the writer to the Hebrews. Now careful attention to words and phrases has its proper place in criticism, but it is a subordinate place. Men may and often must use the current vocabulary of their class and profession to support widely diverging arguments. And Mr. Rendall shows that St. Paul's arguments diverge widely from those of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Their views on the Law of Moses are not indeed inconsistent, but are taken from a wholly different standpoint. To St. Paul it made sin appear more exceeding sinful; to the latter it was simply an imperfect mode of worship. To the former, Jew and Gentile were one in Christ; the latter never even mentions the Gentiles. In fact, so far from being distinctively Pauline, the Epistle to the Hebrews has far more in common with the Epistles of St. James, St. Peter, and with the Apocalypse. Mr. Rendall very clearly shows this, and after all it is only what we should expect. Human nature is intensely conservative, both for good and evil; men are always very slow to change traditional opinions. St. Paul's views were not only new, but abrupt; those of St. Peter, St. James, and the writer of the Hebrews presented no startling contrasts. The theology of St. Paul was not easy for a Jew to accept unless his mind was willing to receive new ideas; on the other hand, St. James's Epistle says nothing likely to startle. And so with the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is an *irenicon*. With St. Paul it spiritualises the Law, yet it offends no traditional opinions. And if with Mr. Rendall we hold it to be written either just before, or during the siege of Jerusalem, we can well see why it should be both spiritualising and conciliatory. It was a terrible time for the Christianised Jews, and they needed a comforting assurance that in Christianity they yet had all and even more than the Law had once offered, although temple and temple ceremonial were swept away.

All this Mr. Rendall puts before us in a masterly essay—one worthy of being marked for re-perusal. Nor are the essays the only good part of the book. As we have said, the translation is excellent, bringing before the English reader the force of the Greek so far as possibly may be. We do not say that either it or commentary will put the English reader on a level

with the Greek scholar. But for those who "occupy the room of the unlearned" in Greek scholarship, Mr. Rendall has written by far the best commentary on this Epistle we have ever seen.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE BASIS OF CHRISTIAN UNITY. By the Rev. S. Kettlewell, M.A. Vol. I., p. 438. Wells, Gardner and Co. 1888.

Two hundred varying Protestant sects in England, Dissent bearing seed after its kind; such, according to Mr. Kettlewell, is the sad state of things shown by the latest religious returns. So great, so hurtful are the evils of division, that they are receiving attention from all sections of the Church, with the result that organisations such as the Association for the Unity of Christendom, the Evangelical Alliance, the Home Reunion Society, the Young Men's Christian Association, and others, have been formed either to lessen these evils or to bring about reunion of the churches.

The work now sent forth is a treatise on the history of the Church from the one point of view of its solidarity. The opening chapter deals with the evils of divisions, their widespread, their injurious influences in bringing reproach upon Christianity at home, hindering the home and foreign mission work, causing waste of strength, setting one part of the nation against the other, making the Word of God of none effect, disregarding the will of Christ, and furthering the purpose of Satan. All these charges are fully established.

The great things on which Christians are agreed, and which may be laid down as the Basis of Union, are stated. We are shown that the Church is a society, not a collection of societies, having its rules and its sacraments, taking the sacred Scriptures as its justification, and the Lord Jesus for its head. Alliances, where men work together for special objects, are good, but it is remarked that of themselves they will not lead to union. Dissent is an evil, not so much because of its peculiar opinions, but because it *is* Dissent, a rending asunder of those who should be one. The recent correspondence between the Bishop of Winchester and Canon Wilberforce is given *in extenso* for the purpose of showing that, as the Bishop justly says, though a clergy may reasonably look on godly baptized Dissenters and pious Romanists as fellow-Christians, he is not therefore to minister either in a Dissenting congregation or at a Roman altar: the one is as contrary to unity as the other.

After stating opinions of enlightened Nonconformists in favour of unity, the author offers analogies in the case of army and navy discipline, the management of railway companies, and the like, and reasons that the Church should also be in the hands of a directing body, which body is the episcopate.

The historical argument now begins. These men, all ordained by apostles, have left writings, and each bearing witness to the oneness of the Church and its government. For sixteen centuries nothing in the way of Presbyterian, Congregational, or Independent organisation appears. A body of rules, the apostolical canons, though, like the creed, not immediately from the Twelve, give important testimony to the practice of the first two centuries, and were for that object appealed to at the Nicene Council in 325, and by authors such as Cyprian and Tertullian, who lived, the one a half, the other an entire century earlier. Many canons are given at length. We instance one or two. "Let a priest or deacon, and the rest of the clergy, be ordained by one bishop." "Let not a bishop, priest, or deacon put away his wife on the pretext of religion, and if he should put her away, let him be excommunicated." "If any priest should despise his own bishop, and collect hearers at another place, and raise another altar, when he can bring no accusation against his bishop concerning religion or justice, let him be deposed." "If any of the clergy or laity pray in the assembly of Jews or heretics, let him both be deposed and excommunicated."

Besides the argument from the written opinions, we have given us an equally convincing one from the recorded practice of the Church of the first three centuries; it is thence shown from the example of those years that unity is a possibility, notwithstanding which men now say to the contrary. Mr. Kettlewell justly remarks that the impossibility of making all think alike no more hinders us from insisting on unity than the impossibility of preventing all from sinning forbids us to contend for holiness.

Space does not allow us to follow the author in his dealing with the Council of Nice and the Arian context; how ancient doctrines and the consent of the one Church was the thing considered. There is with many a disposition to condemn Constantine, this book may help to show what was the true state of things, how unfettered the Council was, how really liberal the emperor's views were. One point clearly appears, neither Papal nor Presbyterian government then existed in the Church.

From this time there was a constant struggle to maintain unity. Macedonian, Pelagians, Denatists, Apollinarians, Eutychians tried hard to rend the Christian body. Crowds of half-taught heathen were hurried to baptism, often to relapse into wild barbarism, or to disgrace the Christian name if they still retained it, the worldly and ungodly climbed even into sacred parts, the emperors were no longer Constantine and Theodosius. How the four great councils guarded the faith, how amidst all the disputes none ever arose about the form of Church government, how the Roman bishop first put in a claim for supremacy, is dealt with in chapter IX.

The united Church at work, overcoming barbarism, sending its St. Patrick, its Augustine, its Theodore, are brought to view, and here the history of our own ecclesiastical system commences. One solemn warning is pointed by the writer. It is notable that Mohammedanism swallowed up the separatist communities; with it they made common cause amongst the Church Catholic, and to its tyranny and strong delusions they were given over. A Jew and two heretical Christians helped to evolve the Koran.

The book comprises twelve chapters, the last two being a survey of Church history to our own day. The history is marked into periods of three hundred years each, the era of unbroken accord, the era of struggle to preserve that accord, the new struggle of the Roman bishops to obtain command from themselves, their final victory over resisting churches attained by kingly influence, deceit and fraud, that insurrection against thraldom known as the Reformation, the forging of fresh fetters by the aid of the Jesuits and the Trentine and Vatican Councils.

The Papacy is shown to be the grand source of disunion.

The last chapter is headed "The Sad Consequences of this Departure from the Basis Unity." Most instructive it is. The old independence of our National Church

and its protest against Roman oppression are clearly put. When dealing with Henry VIII.'s reversion towards the old system, some points should be conceded. Not only the king, but his best advisers, such as More, took like views. The Anabaptist excesses in Germany, the violence and sacrilege of the German troops at Rome, the disputes of parties in England, made thinking men fear that a reign of socialist and infidel anarchy might be introduced if the reforming movement went on too rapidly.

How entirely the Council of Trent failed in being anyway a representative assembly, what was the character and action of the Pope, what protests were made afterwards, Mr. Kettlewell tells us, briefly, but convincingly. The same dreary tale has to be repeated, though the Pope is this time a far nobler man and influenced by higher aims, when the Vatican Council of 1870 is considered. Just as the Spanish bishops, earnest Catholics, complained of foul play, and of being overborne at Trent, so a body of leading bishops besought Pius IX. on their knees to grant liberty to the Church, and assured the Pope that they could vouch for a hundred and twenty of the Vatican assembly being of their mind. But no—liberty, ancient custom, Catholicism, have no place in the Papal system.

The second volume is to show how a return to a true Base of Unity was so marred at the Reformation, and in places so entirely frustrated, and what are still the existing hindrances. In addition to this, the will and design of the Lord concerning unity, and how the earlier centuries endeavoured to carry this out, are to be more fully exhibited.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE MIRACLE AT CANA OF GALILEE.

SIR,—The sermon on this subject in your present number for 9th inst., requires some comment.

1. What is new is not always true, but demands careful examination. A wish to startle people is a great snare.

2. The sermon speaks of the water-pots as if people's hands were dipped down into them, so that the impure water was not possibly turned into wine. But it is more likely that water was poured on people's hands, so that the vessels were now partly empty (see 2 Kings iii. 11).

3. The contents being given, and its being said that the vessels were now filled up to the brim, favour the idea that it was the water in them that was turned into wine.

4. The Greek word would favour the idea that a smaller vessel was dipped in, and so the wine drawn out.

5. I really think people ought to be more cautious in trying to upset the uninterrupted notions on such subjects. The old land-marks being recklessly removed, all doctrines may be swept away—nay, whole books.

AN IRISH CHURCHMAN.

P.S.—If the water in the six vessels had nothing to do with the miracle, why are they named at all, or their capacity, or their being filled to the brim? The "draw out now," coming immediately after their being filled, favours the received idea.

THE SIGN OF JONAH THE PROPHET.

SIR,—I have read the reply of "C. P. M." in the PULPIT of the 9th, to my suggestion that most probably the words ascribed to our Lord about Jonah in the whale's belly are not really His, without being convinced that I was wrong.

When He was rebuking the Jews for seeking a sign, it seems to me it would have been quite irrelevant to speak either of the sign of Jonah's deliverance or of His own resurrection. As for the general trustworthiness of St. Matthew's Gospel, I have no doubt of it, and I think it very probable that the words in question were inserted by some early copyist. This, it is true, is cutting the knot; but I think that to cut it in this way is far less liable to the charge of rashness, than to admit, (as "C. P. M." appears to do by approving the letter of "Presbyter" in the PULPIT of the 2nd) that our Lord referred to Jonah's deliverance and His own resurrection as parallel events, while in fact the former was only an apologue. I do not charge "C. P. M." with "rashness" or "dangerousness"—I would not make such a charge, unless the interests of morality were directly involved; I only think my suggestion is the least improbable solution of a question which must be very perplexing to believers who do not wish to shut their eyes to difficulties.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

12th March, 1889.

SIR,—The argument for regarding the Book of Jonah as purely historical, drawn from our Lord's citation of it, seems to me to be this:—That He would not have quoted, as typical of Himself, a fictitious circumstance, or one thought to be fictitious, because the use of such an illustration might be construed so as to transfer the fictitiousness to His prophecy of His death and resurrection. I see nothing in this. No common person's statement is doubted or questioned because he uses illustration from fable or fiction in making his statement. It would not have occurred to any one of Christ's audience that He was uttering a false prophecy because He gave Jonah as an illustration, supposing that Jonah was thought at that time, which I very much doubt, to be a mythical person.

A letter in to-day's PULPIT says that Mr. Murphy gets rid of the Gospel because he thinks our Lord more correctly reported in St. Luke than in St. Matthew. It would be as reasonable for Mr. Murphy to say that your correspondent gets rid of St. Luke. I do not know whether he or "Presbyter" will think it worth while to remark on the letter I speak of. If they do, your readers will probably have something to instruct them better than some badly-expressed vituperation.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

16th March, 1889.

SIR,—The chief object of my former letter was to point out that critical inquiry into the nature of the book of Jonah ought not to be prejudiced by theological inferences from our Lord's references to it; in other words, that if the general character of the book leads us to take it as an unhistorical apologue, or

sto ry, composed under Divine inspiration for a didactic pu rpose, and rightly included in the sacred canon, t here is nothing in our Lord's use of it which is irreconcilable with that conclusion. Of even *His* teaching the outward form was necessarily conditioned by the religious beliefs and mental habits of His countrymen ; and so long as the book passed without question as not only inspired but also historical, His use of it, whether to point a warning or furnish a type of Himself, may be called natural and reasonable, and was certainly in accordance with New Testament usage.

It is curious that the ground on which your correspondent chiefly rested his argument is frankly abandoned as untenable in the Speaker's Commentary, although the old view is still upheld there. The writer allows that the typical reference "seems as cogent on the supposition of the book being an inspired parable, as on that of its being an authentic narrative." It is on the other reference that he takes his stand. But where is the difference? If our Lord's words that "Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale" are not valid to prove the historical character of the incident, why should His statement that "The men of Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonah" be any more valid for a like purpose? The New Testament usage, for edification, of commonly believed but unhistorical incidents is perfectly plain. I mentioned two instances of it in the references to the legends about Michael, and about the accompanying rock ; and as the force of the latter is sometimes evaded by laying stress on the epithet "spiritual," I would point out that the same epithet is applied to the manna and the water, which were certainly none the less real and material for being "spiritual," *i.e.*, mystical or typical ; just as "the city where our Lord was crucified, was not the less real for being "spiritually called Sodom and Egypt." Another instance may be seen in the use, alike by St. Stephen, St. Paul, and the writer to the Hebrews, of the legend that the law was given by the agency of angels; another perhaps in St. James' allusion to the patience of Job.

But not to dwell on what is so evident, I would ask your permission to go back to the ancient story, and add some remarks on the two chief points :—1. Is it historical? 2. What is its motive or lesson?

1. I have already urged that on the surface it has all the characteristics of an Oriental didactic apologue ; but besides this, on closer inspection many minor features betray its unhistorical character. For instance, the real Jonah was a northern prophet, contemporary with Amos, and lived in an age when the early tribal conception of Jehovah had grown into the recognition of His universal sovereignty; and both to escape from His presence and to resist His prophetic impulse, were considered impossible. See Amos ix. 2 and iii. 8. Yet Jonah, while confessing that he fears Jehovah, the God of heaven, which hath made the sea and the dry land, refuses his prophetic mission, and expects to escape from the Lord's presence by flying to Tarshish. Again, the motive assigned at the end of the book, for his flight is scarcely credible. At first we are left with the impression that he recoiled from the danger of flinging his threatening message in the face of the imperial majesty of Assyria ; yet we are told afterwards that what he shrank from with such invincible terror, was the foreseen success of his mission ! Was ever real prophet so utterly irrational and perverse? Then he ships at Joppa, a name unknown to the Old Testament before the captivity, and a southern port very unlikely to be chosen by the prophet of Gath-hepher (in Galilee), but naturally mentioned by a post-exilian author writing at Jerusalem. The omission in i. 2 of what he is to say, although in iii. 2 he is referred to the message then given him, is suspicious ; so also is the absence of such details as the place where he was vomited out, the offence of the Ninevites, the name of their king, and the medium of communication with them ; moreover, the relation of the Prayer to the narrative is certainly unhistorical. What is given as Jonah's cry "out of the fish's belly" for deliverance is, in reality, a thanksgiving for accomplished deliverance which might have suited any shipwrecked person, or indeed anyone who had been brought out of grievous trouble and danger ; and it borrows phrases from several extant Psalms, one or two of which at least are probably of later date than the real Jonah. It bears the mark of not being composed for the occasion, but adopted and worked in as suitable in tone. A late date for the story is also betrayed by the explanation : "Now Nineveh was an exceedingly great city, etc.," and by the way in which the Ninevites are mentioned. The real prophets who prophesied against Nineveh were wont to inveigh with passionate indignation against "the bloody city" for its savage oppression of Jehovah's people ; but here their sufferings are viewed through the softening veil of distance, and the writer has nothing but sympathy and tenderness for the ancient oppressor. Once more the exquisite apologue of the castor-oil plant is awkwardly fitted on to the foregoing narrative, and the contradictory statements suggest that the author by an after-thought gave a polemical turn to his work.

2. To such indications as these of the unhistorical character of the book, additional force would be given if its didactic purpose could be ascertained, and connected with a definite period of Jewish development. This, I think, can be done.

Let us turn to the magnificent prophecy, which towards the close of the exile set forth the calling and office of Israel as "Jehovah's servant." Its main outline is as follows :—In the Divine purpose Israel is the Messianic nation, charged with a prophetic office for the world, and bearing in its bosom the hope of the world's salvation. But historically it has been rebellious against its vocation, and has wrought no deliverance in the earth ; punishment has therefore come upon it, and Babylon has swallowed it up. This apparent ruin, however, is no frustration of the Divine purpose, but an ordained step in its accomplishment. Out of the jaws of the destroyer the elect nation shall come forth newly equipped for its mission, and shall become a light to the nations, a herald of salvation to the ends of the earth.

Now, in the Jonah of the story, all these features are strikingly reproduced in a speaking figure. Charged with a mission of merciful warning to the great Gentile metropolis, he rebels and flies. Punishment overtakes him, and he is swallowed up by the sea monster. Yet this catastrophe is not suffered to be his destruction, but is made a step towards the fulfilment of his commission. Wonderfully preserved, he bears his witness to the guilty city, and his ministry avails to save it. Thus, as a parabolic personation, Jonah represents feature for feature, the peculiar conception of God's Israel as set forth by the great prophet of the exile ; and we have another instance of that individualising representation of the nation which is common to several of the exilian and post-exilian Psalms, where the ideal righteous man is the nation personified, and which may possibly underlie the book

of Job also. How the author of Jonah may have got the idea of figuring the going into captivity by the swallowing up of the prophet by a sea monster may be learnt from Jer. li. 34, 44; where of the carrying away it is said: "Nebuchadnezzar hath swallowed me up like a dragon": and of the return, "I will bring forth out of his mouth that which he hath swallowed up."

But what of the final turn given to the story, where Jonah is represented as bitterly resenting God's gracious acceptance of the Gentile, and thereby drawing down the rebuke of heaven on his narrow bigotry? Just this; that after the return, as there is evidence in Ezra, and elsewhere, two parties grew up in the Jewish State, one exclusive, the other liberal, in regard to the relations of the Jew with the Gentile; and the writer, having constructed his story so as to support the view of the liberals, ends by turning it into a direct attack on the bigotry of their opponents, and thus in a measure anticipates our Lord's portraiture of the prodigal's elder brother.

I will only add that, on the supposition that Israel is personified in the Jonah of the story, the typical purport comes out as a direct consequence. Israel, we know, as viewed ideally in the Divine purpose, was a type of the Christ who finally summed it up in Himself, and fulfilled its Messianic function, so that the captivity and subsequent return were truly prophetic adumbrations of the Redeemer's passion and resurrection. But what is true of the nation must be equally true of its symbolic representative; and hence the sign of Jonah is, not merely by accommodation, but by a real and purposed relation, the sign of the Son of man.

PRESBYTER.

In view of the comments of a section of the Liberal and Dissenting press on the appointment of the Rev. A. G. Edwards to the bishopric of St. Asaph, the following cutting from the *Tyst*, a Welsh Dissenting paper, under the editorship of Dr. Thomas, will be read with interest:—"The new Bishop of St. Asaph is a man of great power. . . . . I know of no man among the Welsh clergy so worthy of the honour. He is a zealous Churchman; and I should not give a button for a man without zeal for his faith."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Black, Rev. Alured Elliot, M.A., Rector of Oxnead and Vicar of Buxton, Norfolk.
Bourke, Rev. C. F. J., M.A., Vicar of St. Giles's, Reading; Sub-Dean of Truro Cathedral and Rector of Truro.
Case, Rev. Frederick, M.A., Vicar of Tudeley-cum-Capel, Kent.
Cave-Brown, Rev. W. H., Rector of Wickham St. Paul's, Essex.
Claridge, Rev. Charles William, Perpetual Curate of St. Thomas's, Heigham, Norwich.
Corr, Rev. John, Vicar of Warthing, Sussex.
Crowley, Rev. Cedric Edwin, M.A., Senior Curate of Great Grimsby, Lincolnshire, Vicar of St. George's, Portsea.
Dunn, Rev. J. W., late Head Master of St. Austin's, Dulwich; Vicar of Pirbright, Woking.
Elwell, Rev. G. H., M.A., Rector of Brockley, Somerset.
Evans, Rev. Canon Howell, Vicar of Potton; Chaplain to the Bishop-elect of St. Asaph.
Gent, Rev. G. W., Principal of St. Mark's College, Chelsea; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop-elect of St. Asaph.
Golland, Rev. C. E., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, Glasson, Lancaster.
Graham, Rev. Edward Arthur, Rector of Thornbury, Devonshire.
Hadow, Rev. John Lovell Gwatkin, Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Aldershot; Rector of Melcombe Regis-cum-Radipole, Dorsetshire.
Hare, Rev. Hugh James, Vicar of Docking, Norfolk; Rural Dean of Heacham.
Harford, Rev. Edward John, M.A., Vicar of Bathford; Prebendary of Coombe First in Wells Cathedral.
Howell, Rev. Canon D., Vicar of Wrexham; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop-elect of St. Asaph.
James, Very Rev. H. A., Dean of St. Asaph; Chaplain to the Bishop-elect of St. Asaph.
Jenkins, Rev. Richard Meredith, Curate of Margam: Rector of Llangasty Tallyllyn, Brecon.
Jones, Rev. John Rees, M.A., Curate of Llangyfelach; Perpetual Curate of St. Michael and All Angels', Dafen, Carmarthenshire.
Kyffin, Rev. T. Lloyd, M.A., Rector of Llanbadrig, Anglesey; Vicar of Llanfaes-cum-Penmon, Beaumaris.
Leigh, Rev. J. de Verd, B.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Aldershot.
Lillie, Rev. Philip A., Curate-in-Charge of School Lane District, Walton-le-Dale.
Owen, Rev. A. F. C., Curate of Christ Church, Ealing; British Chaplain at Genoa.
Payne, Rev. Charles Lennard, Rector of Lesnewth, Cornwall.
Pratt, Rev. Walter S., Curate of St. Paul's, Adlington, Lancashire; Sole Charge of St. Columba's, Collingtree, Northampton.
Russell, Rev. George Wilkes, Vicar of Hognaston, Derbyshire.
Smith, Rev. Thomas N. Hart, M.A., Assistant-Master at Marlborough; Head Master of Epsom College.
Stephens, Rev. L. J., Rector of Penhurst and Vicar of Ashburnham.
Stradling, Rev. W. J. L. S., M.A., Vicar of Marloes; Rector of Herbrandston, Pembrokeshire.
Thomas, Ven. Archdeacon D. R., Vicar of Meifod; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop-elect of St. Asaph.
Thompson, Rev. A. Scott, Senior Curate of Halesworth; Vicar of Peasenhall, Suffolk.
Trefusis, Rev. Prebendary R. E., Vicar of Chittlehampton; Rural Dean of Southmolton.
Vawdrey, Rev. A. A., M.A., Vicar of St. Gluvias-with-Budock.
Ward, Rev. Theodor Muller, M.A., Rector of Bamford, Derbyshire.
Waugh, Rev. Arthur Thornhill, Vicar of St. Mary's, Brighton, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon; Honorary Canon of Ripon Cathedral.
Williams, Rev. Watkin, Vicar of Bodelwyddan; Chaplain to the Bishop-elect of St. Asaph.
Winch, Rev. George Thomas, B.A., Vicar of Brompton, Northallerton.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Adley, Rev. William, at Rudbaxton Rectory, Haverfordwest, on the 6th inst., aged 96.
Edersheim, Rev. Alfred, Ph.D., D.D., M.A. (Oxon), Grinfield Lecturer in the University of Oxford, at Mentone, suddenly, on the 16th inst., aged 64 years.
Glascott, Rev. W. E., at Brill Vicarage, Bucks, on the 8th inst., aged 50.
Jones, Rev. Thomas Henry, Rector of Ashwell, at Ashwell, Rutland, on the 15th inst., aged 66.
Leigh, Rev. Francis Joseph, M.A., Vicar, at Buckland Vicarage, Faringdon, Berkshire, on the 17th inst., in the 70th year of his age.
Penoyre, Rev. William Francis Raymond S., J.P., of the Moor, Herefordshire, Prebendary of Hereford Cathedral, at 14, Pittville Parade, Cheltenham, on the 14th inst., aged 84.
Sheppard, Rev. Henry Winter, for forty-five years Rector of Emsworth, at the Rectory, Emsworth, Hants, on the 18th inst., aged 80.
Stack, Rev. John Maurice, M.A. (Camb.), Priest-in-Charge, at St. John's Vicarage, Isle of Dogs, on the 11th inst., aged 39.
Whitworth, Rev. Thomas, at Thorpe, St. Peter's, on the 13th inst., aged 82.

The Church of England Pulpit.

CHRISTIAN COMFORT: WHAT IS IT?

By the Rev. J. P. SANDLANDS, M.A.

Sermon Preached in St. Andrew's Church, Brigstock, on Sunday, February 17th, 1889.

"And all his sons and all his daughters rose up to comfort him; but he refused to be comforted."—Gen. xxxvii. 35.

HOW could Jacob find any consolation in the conduct of his comforters? It was hollow, insincere, unreal. They had occasioned his grief, for they had deprived him of his son. He had no positive idea of their treachery; but he was not altogether without discernment. His thoughts penetrated the thin veil of hypocrisy which they threw over their misdoings. And so he refused to be comforted. "Miserable comforters are ye all!" Ye do but add fuel to the flame—sorrow to my afflictions. We shall not pursue the subject further in this connection. Our purpose this morning is to show that there are unreal as well as real comforters in the world; and that there is also fictitious as well as genuine comfort. We do this with the further view of helping ourselves to distinguish the false from the true; and, distinguishing, to hold fast that which is good. Our text sanctions, if it does not teach, illustrate and enforce, our method of procedure. May the Lord be present with us in our meditations, and so help us by His Holy Spirit's teaching and influence, that we may recognise that the Lord Jesus is the only true and great Comforter; and that of the comfort men can bring there is none like His! May He hear and answer us for the sake of that same dear Lord and Comforter!

Our first point is, *that there are amongst us unreal comforters who seek to administer fictitious comfort.*

There is a very great deal of hypocrisy in the world. Perhaps, there are no circumstances wherein its workings are so evident as in the giving of comfort to friends in distress. The comfort is not real, and is not meant to be. The words are delusive, for they are sounds merely. They cover no ideas, and do but at best serve to conceal the real feelings of indifference that are entertained.

Take an instance. A person is sick, and a friend is calling. "I must give some sort of comfort, because it is the thing to do. I do not know precisely what to say, but something must be done. It is of little consequence that the sick person is in the last stages of his illness, and that there is no hope of recovery. I must say the usual thing." And what is this? "Oh, you must cheer up. You must not be so despondent. You are not any worse than our friend so and so, and he got better. Then your doctor is very clever and he can pull you through. He has succeeded in worse cases than yours. I am sorry I cannot stay any longer, but I am so pressed just now. I hope to come again and find you better, almost well indeed."

The friend leaves, only too glad to get away. He enjoys a half-conscious belief that he has done a kind thing, while he only relieved himself of what at most was but an irksome duty. He little knows how really he has played the hypocrite.

But now, what of the sick person? Is he deceived? No. He reasons after this manner. "I am very ill. My sickness can only be a work of time, and that, perhaps, very short. I am very ill, and my friend must know it. The evidences are so many and so palpable. Why has he talked to me after that fashion? He has tried to comfort me, but I cannot be deceived so easily. The hope is false, and he is playing the hypocrite." Like Jacob, he refuses to be comforted.

Take another case. A woman has lost her husband. He was a profligate, and lived entirely for himself—the gratification of his own desires, and greed for pleasure. There is not one of God's laws he has not set at defiance. He has scarcely observed the common proprieties that distinguish respectable people. But she has friends, and they feel something must be done. They call or, otherwise, write letters. And what is the tenour of what they say and write? It is that of administering comfort. They take no notice, in doing this, of the past life. It is of no moment, in their account, that all that is decent has been outraged, that God's name has been constantly blasphemed, and that His laws have been defied. Oh, dear no; social amenities take no cognisance of these things! The comfort usually administered under these circumstances must be given. Hence things of this sort are said: "You have not lost your husband; he is only gone before. He is gone from a world of woe and misery to one of happiness and bliss. Then, after all, you are not so badly off. You are well provided for, and you have enough to live upon." The poor woman is only too sensible of her position. She knows what she is and what her husband was. Bad, though he was, she had a woman's heart, and a woman's devotion. There is, on this account, a void for her which nothing earthly can fill. And for him—ah, well, she dares not think. How can he have mercy, who never asked for mercy? How can it be well with him who despised the idea that there was or could be a God whose property it is always to have mercy? She knows too well that no comfort on this head is of any value. She feels its unreality. She refuses to be comforted.

It is often our very painful duty to visit the worldly and profane in their dying moments, and to witness their departure into the unseen world

There is no scene more sickening and sad in all God's universe. Aye, friends, if there is one thing more than another that we would prefer not to witness, it is the death of a hardened sinnner. The features of it are distressing, and are these, a callous heart and a seared consience. It too often occurs in these cases that the patient dies without a struggle, and with every appearance of quiet resignation. Then friends put the usual question, What do you think? Was it not a peaceful end? As honest men, what can we answer? Oh, but we must not be pitiless and rude! No, and we cannot limit God's mercy, yet for the sake of those still living in sin, we must say, "To die as a Christian, one must live the Christian life." "Heaven is a prepared place for a prepared people." This is a point to be emphasised, we must be always looking forward to the end and getting ready for it. It cannot, then, take us unawares, for we are always ready. Hence the Saviour says, "Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come."

We will notice, one more instance, out of the many that obtain, of attempts to administer insincere comfort. The reference is to loss of fortune. This too often comes in the shape of seeming calamity; but really as a great blessing. To be possessed of great wealth is not always an unmixed good, and to be deprived of it is not always an unmitigated evil. These things are, however, of little importance. Whenever property is lost, as not unfrequently happens, comfort must be administered to the sufferers. And what shape does it take? Something like this is said, "Your lot is no worse than that of many others. It is nothing like so bad, indeed. Many in better circumstances than you have lost their all, and have regained their position and their fortune. Besides, you are young, and have many friends and acquaintances. Everybody will be ready to lend you a helping hand, for you have by your great kindness won the hearts of all." But all this is the exact contrary of the truth. Men have always many friends while they enjoy much wealth. The measure of the wealth, indeed, is the exact measure of their friends; and so, when the wealth goes, they depart too. The world is always very cold towards the poor. And no one so soon learns this as the man who once was rich. He is quick, therefore, to estimate the real value of the comfort he receives. He knows it is the outcome of hypocrisy, and so he refuses to be comforted.

We might notice many other circumstances wherein the customs of society, not to use a stronger term, seek to administer unreal comfort—comfort which is never received; but let thus much suffice under this head. We proceed to our second point, which is—

II. *There is genuine comfort and there are real comforters.* The false always implies the true, and hypocrisy is but a form of flattery to virtue. We shall notice three sets of circumstances under which the real comforter may, and does administer genuine comfort, viz., (α) to the Poor, (β) to the Mourner, (γ) to the Sinner.

(α.) *The Poor.* The State has recognised the grand fact that we ought to care for the poor. It has sought to make laws to alleviate their many miseries. We stop not now to inquire into the wisdom, or otherwise, of those laws, We care not either to examine into the adequacy of their provisions. We do no more than notice, in passing, that there is such a thing as State provision for the poor. Besides this, there are our many charitable institutions—hospitals, infirmaries, dispensaries, almshouses, *et hoc genus omne.* We make no distinction here, or comparison either, between the work done by the law, and that done by charity. We speak of these things only to show that there is a general consensus, that there is much misery in the shape of poverty, and that it ought to receive our best attention. It would not be right, if we had the power, to circumscribe, in any way, the work done for the poor; but we must never forget that there is always the fear that the poor, notwithstanding all the efforts put forth for their benefit, may refuse to be comforted. Why? The comfort is not administered properly. Perhaps, we cannot better express the method than in these words, "Oh, yes, I suppose you are badly off, and your need must be met; here take this and make the best of it." The main element in the effectual administering of comfort is wanting sympathy. We do not sympathise. We do not "weep with them that weep." Where this is wanting, whatever we may do, we administer no genuine comfort.

Our Saviour puts sympathy in the foreground. It is not the last, but the first thing with Him. Why did He come to suffer and die for us? It was because He felt for us. We were poor. He was rich. He emptied Himself of His riches that He might enrich us! "Who for your sakes became poor that ye through His poverty might be rich." We stop not now to inquire after and to remind ourselves of the many instances, recorded in His word, of His mindfulness of the poor. Let us refer to one only: "The poor have the Gospel preached unto them." There is a power in sympathy to move the heart, and influence the mind which no amount of wealth possesses. This power is too sadly lacking, because sympathy is absent in our works of charity. Help the poor with your hand, but help them rather with your heart, Then we may hope—and the blame is not ours if otherwise—they may not refuse to be comforted.

(β.) *The Mourner.* How can we administer true, genuine, Christian comfort to the bereaved and distressed mourner? Passing through this vale of tears, we meet on our way now a father who has lost a son, or a son who has lost a father, now a mother who has lost a daughter; or a daughter who has lost a mother; now a husband who has lost a wife, or a wife who has lost a husband; now a brother

who has lost a sister, or a sister who has lost a brother; and now a friend who has lost a friend—how shall we comfort these that they may not refuse to be comforted? There is a way, as we have seen, not to administer comfort; which is the right way? Estimate the loss aright. This is the first thing to do. Make it personal. Of what use is it to say others have had similar losses? or that I have suffered in the same or greater degree? It does not relieve other peoples' miseries to recount your own. Poor human nature! This is a very general failing. "You have suffered. True. But you have not suffered like me. Nobody has, nobody can." This is exactly what obtains. A widow has lost her only son. A friend goes to comfort her. He says by way of accomplishing his task, "Another widow has lost hers." The widow in her heart feels no solace in this fact. Secretly she says, "What of that? She has not lost my son. I have lost him myself." Acting so, we do but add fuel to burning flame, anguish to sorrow. If we will really comfort we must, from the widow's standpoint, take in the loss in its awful reality, and mourn with her. Her sorrow must be our sorrow. "Mourn with them that mourn." Aye, but you say, "This is difficult to do;" and so it is. It was on this account no doubt that the wise man wrote: "The heart knoweth its own bitterness, a stranger intermeddleth not therewith." But if less than this be done, the comfort, being unreal, availeth nothing.

We have two instances in the life of Jesus which beautifully illustrates all this. The one is the raising of the Widow's Son at Nain, and the other the raising of Lazarus. The Lord, in the former case, took in the whole circumstances at a glance, and struck forthwith the right chord: "Woman, weep not." Aye, but how shall I not weep, seeing that I have lost my son? "Thou shalt have thy son restored to thee." And so He came and touched the bier, raised her son, and gave him to his mother. In the latter case he listened, and not without interest—loving interest—to the plaints of the sisters, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." The reply, as always, fits in: "Thy brother shall rise again." But there is more than this. There is the deepest sympathy for the miseries of the human race. At the grave the great heart of Jesus feels, and He wept; "Jesus wept." It were impossible to tell how much of compassion for our woes and miseries there is breathed in those short words, "Jesus wept." But He stops not there. He gives out the great words, "Lazarus come forth." And Lazarus issues from the charnel-house and stands alive beside his sisters. There is true sympathy for mourning friends. Go ye and do likewise. Will nothing less do? No, nothing less in kind; less in degree it must be. When we go to the house of mourning—and Solomon says it is better to go there, than to the house of rejoicing—we must take the spirit of Jesus with us. It were better, otherwise, to remain at home. We must learn to weep with them that weep, and make their sorrows ours. We cannot, otherwise, offer the comfort that will not be refused.

(γ.) *Sinners.* This is by far the largest class of those needing comfort. It is a term which includes all men. All are sinners. But there are two kinds of sinners. There are those that feel their need of comfort, and those that do not. But whence does it arise that, seeing that all are needy, some do not feel their need? The answer is an easy one. Many do not know and do not care to know that they are sinners. As soon as a man knows himself a sinner he seeks, and must find, comfort. We can only work and pray for those who do not know themselves sinners, that they may soon find out. We cannot comfort them. It is far otherwise with those who have been led by the Spirit to discover their wretchedness. We can comfort these. We may and must comfort them. But how shall we provide that our comfort be genuine? How shall we administer comfort that they may "not refuse to be comforted"?

How did the Saviour comfort sinners? "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, saith your God." What was then the Saviour's plan? It was to tell sinners that their warfare was accomplished, that their iniquity was pardoned, that they had received at the Lord's hand double for all their sins." And how did He accomplish this? He came down to their level. He "emptied Himself of His glory." "He carried our sorrows and bore our griefs." "The Lord laid upon Him the iniquities of us all." His words were, "I lay down my life for the sheep. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself." This was the Saviour's way of administering comfort. Ours must be like. Oh, but you answer, that is impossible. But it is only impossible in degree, it is not impossible in kind. No other comfort, indeed, will suffice. We cannot come down as the Saviour came down; but we can come down to the level of our fellow sinners. Men talk a great deal about religious equality. Well, here it is, and it is the only religious equality that is possible and practicable. The Saviour came down from the highest heaven to the level of the humblest sinner. We must never talk down from an exalted pinnacle. We cannot comfort in that way. We must come down and talk up. On our knees beside the sinner, and from our hearts must go the prayer—the earnest prayer to the sinner's Friend. We must speak in tones of deep humility of our former lost state by nature, and our present found state by grace. We must plead, and earnestly, that he too may be forgiven. His burden must be our burden, and our heart must go out with his heart, in earnest longings that grace may abound in him. There is no substitute for grace, and there is no comfort but in possessing and enjoying it.

What can take away the load of sin? What can lighten it? What can put away the fear of punishment? What can open heaven? What can

strengthen the weary step of the pilgrim to Zion? Any human help? Oh, dear no. There is only one answer, "My grace is sufficient for it." There is only one way to obtain this grace That way is prayer. That way is open. Use it. Use it often. Use it ever. "Pray without ceasing." So, and only so, can you comfort sinners, and they will not refuse to be comforted." May the Lord own and bless our feeble efforts to glorify Him, and save, and comfort *souls* for His Son's sake! Amen.

CHRISTIANITY AND SCIENCE.*

By the Rev. J. J. DILLON, B.D., Rector of Aghade.

Sermon Preached before the University of Dublin, on Sexagesima Sunday Morning, the 24th February, 1889.

"We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto gentiles foolishness; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."—1 Cor. i. 23, 24 (R.V.).

CHRISTIANITY and Science, the Kingdom of God and Intellectual Culture. How often in the present day do we hear their claims spoken of as antagonistic, hostile, or if not absolutely hostile, at least estranged, indifferent as though the objects of each were quite distinct. I say "in the present day," because there was a time when the Church had the education of the people altogether in her own hands. For centuries the light of the everlasting truth, and the light of knowledge streamed forth from the same source, and the bright beams of the two-fold light warmed and illuminated every circle of society. The Church's influence was felt in the courts of princes and in the home of the subject, in the castle of the proud noble and the cottage of the simple retainer, and hallowed every relation of life. It softened rough manners, curbed wild licentious passions, and moulded the wayward wills of men through the message of the Gospel, through the gentle yet all-overcoming power of love. It inspired science, nourished and fostered art, gave a new and purer ideal for the sculptor's chisel, and created a chastened style of architecture. The ministers of the Gospel, the priests of the Christian Church, had the forming, the moulding of men's thoughts and characters. They were the educators of the minds, the enlighteners of the spirits of the people.

But now it is otherwise. Christianity is not now the sole moulder of the spirits of men, it is no longer the one school for the childhood of humanity, it is not the only informing power of modern society. It is surrounded on all sides by systems of secular education; systems which bring to bear upon the masses a power derived from the wealth and resources which the rich nations of the world have legally granted to them; systems which, if not antagonistic to Christianity, quietly ignore it. They build up, and educate, and mould men according to the principles which they have laid down for their own guidance. They give no assistance to them to think out, and discover some solution to the great problems touching the meaning of our life here, the final destiny of humanity, and the reality of the life beyond the grave.

Naturally a school of scepticism was the result; the literature and the conversation of men educated under these systems became largely imbued with irreverence for Holy things and sacred subjects, and even philosophy was content to treat of duty, and to abdicate the higher prerogatives which it once had claimed.

Is there then any reason for this hostility between Science and Christianity? That the hostility exists no one can for a moment doubt. You cannot open a magazine or a novel of the day without being brought face to face with it; but is there any reason why on the one side of a vast gulf the Church should find itself in close companionship with ignorant prejudice, and a narrow unenlightened caste-spirit; while on the other stand refined intellect, and free thought with its developed sense for beauty and form, both closely connected with unbelief, with the smile of mockery, the curl of the lip, indifference, nay, scorn for the narrowness and hypocrisy of those who call themselves the elect, and bid others stand aside because they are holier?

Certainly not; this hostility exists because of faults on both sides. On the side of the Church a narrow spirit and miserable prejudices. One deeply impressed by the truths of Christianity * says, "The present aspect of the Christian world, with its sharply-divided and hostile churches and sects mutually hating and incriminating one another, has something very repulsive in it. There is something very wrong. The Church bears a heavy weight of guilt. According to its inmost essence it was meant to be the powerfullest bond of union, because possessed and filled by love, and yet what divisions! It was meant to establish peace, it has kindled strife and fearful wars. It was meant to give men certainty and confidence; it has provoked doubt and planted mistrust in their minds; the Church has much still to learn." But there are faults also on the other side, faults naturally engendered of the undue exaltation of intellect. Correct these faults—faults which after all are very human—and, between the religion of Christ, and the moral reasonable intellect, there need be no conflict, there need be perfect harmony between thought and faith, between mind and spirit.

St. Paul in our text and elsewhere shows this very plainly; he shows how there may be a reconciliation,

* For a few thoughts in this sermon I am indebted to one of "The Fatherland's" most thoughtful writers, Carl Schwarz, Oberconsistorialrath at Gotha.

* Dr. Döllinger.

a deep, true, real reconciliation, a reconciliation which we may feel is just and justifiable, a reconciliation which our hearts and consciences may accept.

We can afford to listen to him with respect, and take him as our guide, for he was not only learned in all that was taught in the Jewish schools, but he had mastered the best thoughts of the heathen poets, and had absorbed the treasures of Grecian wisdom, and the polish of Grecian refinement. How then does he reconcile the sharp contradictions of which he was fully conscious between all this Jewish and heathen learning and the teaching of the Cross?

He does so by pointing out the difference that exists between a falsely-so-called scientific education which is antagonistic to the Gospel, and the true which is not ashamed of the doctrines of the crucified One. That what the Gentiles termed "foolishness" was the true wisdom which the Greeks sought after, but found not; that which they considered weakness was an all-conquering Power, and what they spoke of as the shame of the Cross was never-paling glory, for it was "Chrst the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

But it may here be objected, "St. Paul speaks of mysteries, of visions and things above the sphere of our senses. We cannot admit the mysterious, it is inconsistent with that intellectual dignity which becomes us men; we may not admit anything which cannot be administered to by the natural intelligence of the soul."

We answer, Is not the world around us full of mysteries? Are not its students compelled to admit the existence of that which is beyond the power and range of their bodily organs? Does not the astronomer readily acknowledge that there must be stars and suns which even his most powerful instrument cannot as yet enable him to detect? Does not the entomologist confess "that the analogies of his science lead him to regard it as almost certain that there is an order of creatures yet invisible to the organs of sense, though these organs be aided by all the scientific apparatus which as yet has been discovered, and that a world still lies beyond his reach, which a higher power than sense must discover"?* Who can understand in all its varied effects what we call vegetation growth? who is there that will explain for us gravitation? who knows anything about "attraction," which is "the hidden force on which creation's law depends"? who will unfold for us the laws which regulate the social world and its awfully chequered aspect, joy and sorrow, trouble and prosperity, peace and strife, plenty and want, ease and labour? Then look within at our own marvellous being. so strange, so complex—whether we regard the physical, spiritual, or intellectual nature? Who can think of the dark mysterious, inexplicable problems here presented to him so full of difficulties which cannot be unravelled, and paradoxes which perplex all who think and then say, "we cannot admit mysteries or anything which cannot be ministered to by the natural intelligence of the soul"? If we be compelled to admit that there are things in this world beyond our cognisance, why dogmatise as to their non-existence in the future?

But, again, it may by others be objected, "St. Paul's teaching was well fitted to the age he lived in. Humanity had only just emerged from childhood. It had indeed quitted school, but had only entered on its university life. St. Paul's teaching was of course a long way in advance of the teaching of the early schools, but *we* require teaching still more advanced we have now reached full manhood. The mental food which was suited to the child, the boy, the youth, must now be changed, and made suitable to the wants of men. We require a higher education, such as will enable us to look into the heart of every problem, and to question the origin and reason of all things."

There is much truth in all this; and amongst those who thus speak we must not forget are to be found many souls which glow with a pure and devoted love of truth; in fact, the scientific spirit is in itself a truth-loving, truth-seeking spirit, and there are many of these searchers after truth who are saddened at being compelled to range themselves on the side of the opponents of the Gospel. We should therefore respect their objections, and inquire patiently into what they want, and how we may meet their requirements, for we have nothing to fear. Our faith in the living God, and our confidence in His truth lead us to court investigation.

What then do they require? If we can trust their writings, if they mean what they say, and if they do not mean much more than their words convey, they want a riper training of the intellect, the development of a purer taste, the sharpening of the understanding, the moulding of the whole character through science, through art, through observation, through travel and intercourse with men that their judgment over men and things may be just, that they may value aright the evolutions in history, and the great interests in life, and become more capable of appreciating all that is beautiful and great and good.

This is what they say they require and must have. What they find a difficulty in accepting is the miraculous in the Revelation of Church doctrine. They deem it essential to the supposed dignity of their reason to deny the Incarnation, the Passion, the Resurrection and the doctrine of the ever blessed Trinity, because here problems are suggested which unilluminated reason cannot solve, and glimpses afforded of a world on which she may not presume to enter. We see then the melancholy spectacle of antagonists who think a reconciliation impossible. A wide gulf is between them, on the one side of it those who condemn to eternal per-

* cf. Liddon's University Sermons.

dition, on the other, pity and compassion, scorn or utter indifference.

And yet there is a reconciliation, a reconciliation of simple practical Christianity, and the highest, noblest, truest education of the heart and intellect.

For, what do the best and noblest among the men of science long for? Do they not themselves confess their earnest desire that revealed truth may be a reality? Do they not say that in their best moments they feel that there is indeed a God whose watchful providence ordereth all things in heaven and on earth, and that they who wait on Him shall not be ashamed, but shall be blessed for evermore. They confess that even nature reveals this, and that the still small voice within, which we call conscience, corroborates nature's teaching.

In their best moments they look up and ask for "more light." They feel that this life is not all; that the universe is not a "dreary empty void," nor a "chaos of confusion and strife," nor a "piece of mechanism as reckless as it is resistless in its might," but a place of love as well as of law, a place of preparation for the home beyond, where the spirit goes to Him who made it.

Now here is the point where true Christianity and true education meet, and where they may be made to aid one another. For, what is Christianity? I do not mean the outward form, the shell, the husk, that which is superficial and changing. But what is true Christianity? What is it that must live and abide? What is it that has secured the victory to it for the past two thousand years? What is it that gives to it its present power, and right to assert itself? It is not a mere doctrine, or set of doctrines—however useful these may be—it is spirit and life. It is not a system of opinions, it is a divine principle renewing and transforming the heart. It is a power, the power of God to make blessed. It is the power of His Spirit. The age we live in is the age of the Spirit, and Christianity is the religion of the Spirit. But how do we become possessed of this new abiding Spirit? How do we become living members of His communion and fellowship?

The way is a dark one. It is through death and the grave. Over the grave stands the Cross. It is the unchanging sign of the Christian. Out of the darkness we climb up into the light, out of death we are raised to new life. What, then, is the innermost secret of Christianity? Death and the new birth. As the greatest of the German poets has said, "Die and re-exist, for so long as this is not accomplished thou art but a troubled guest upon an earth of gloom." He who through this dark way and these narrow gates is gone forth, he who has conquered the old life of the flesh through the new life of the Spirit, and out of this living, free, free-making, love-fulfilling Spirit lives, he is the true Christian. In saying this we do not "accommodate Christianity to the changed circumstances and imperious necessities of the time," but declare what is true in Christianity for all time. Is not this the teaching of our text? "We preach Christ crucified, the power of God, and the wisdom of God." What is the ground thought of the whole passage? Is it not the purifying power of a death, the death which the Christ suffered, and in which was revealed the fulness of His pure life, of His Divine love, and from which life was breathed forth over the God-estranged world? This death we suffer, when like Christ we have our flesh crucified, and, unlike Him, because He had no need to do so, we crucify in addition our affections and lusts. That is a death of glory—far, far more glorious than any accomplished on the field of battle—for through it is the way to life.

This is the unalterable condition which Christ demands for entrance into His kingdom, "except a man be born anew"—except a man "die and re-exist"—"he cannot see the kingdom of God." These are the words of the Christ to the wise man in Israel; they are still His words to the wise in all ages.

Have we not then here the answer to the earnest longings of all true searchers after truth? What is it that we said they earnestly desire? Recall their own words. They want the intellect to be trained, a purer taste to be developed, the character to be moulded, all their thoughts and aspirations to be raised and ennobled, and the spirit within so formed that it may ever discern between truth and error, and know how to choose the good, the beautiful and the true, and refuse the evil, falsehood and wrong. How then can these longings be fulfilled unless through the teachings of Christianity which has for its aim the reforming of the whole man, which insists on the death of all that would draw down our thoughts and cause them to grovel in the dust of earth, and the re-existence of all that is spiritual, all that eternally abides? Can earth or the things of time and sense satisfy the inward longings of our souls? Can our spirits be fully developed in the petty and narrow life around us, amid the prejudices of parties and sects, the things which belong to yesterday and to-day, and cease with their ceasing? Nay, we must have a wider view opened up for us; our spirits must have the privilege of ranging through the great household of God with its many mansions. We must be taught the earnestness of life and its holy duties, and, at the same time, saved from the folly of dwelling exclusively on the external and the human side of things. We must learn that which the Hebrews were taught by their very language, that the soul, the life, ourselves, are all one and the same. The Hebrews knew it, for they had but one word for all three, and the Christ completed the teaching which their language faintly unfolded, when He declared that if they lost their life they lost themselves, and nothing here could compensate them for the loss.

If, then, Christianity, and Christianity alone, can train the thoughts, and mould the character,

and educate men for eternity, developing within them a sense of the beautiful and the good, surely education, however advanced, and Christianity, should go hand in hand through life. There should be no hostility between them. The temple of art, the hall of science, and the Church of the living God should all stand together in closest bonds, ever strengthening each other, while they strengthen and draw closer together the loving, helping bonds by which they are united. There have been faults on all sides in the past. How many of the noblest and most gifted have been compelled sorrowfully to withdraw from the Church of their forefathers because of her one-sidedness and intolerance, because of the narrowing in of her walls so as to crush the spirit of those who long for breadth and depth, who desire room for the enlarging, ennobling thoughts and aspirations which filled their souls, and which must be allowed space to become developed and perfected: because she tried to close every crevice through which each breath of the free-streaming air of the great Revelation of God in nature might penetrate. Oh, how sad to see those who are touched by a Divine genius, and in whose spirits everlasting thoughts are enthroned, yet wandering outside in the semi-darkness, lit up only by the faint light of their own unaided intellects! An unstilled longing for rest runs through all their sayings and writings, a continual confession that in their better moments their spirits long for God—long for some One who shall fill the aching void and supply the anxious yearnings which in spite of their vaunting is *their* portion, who have said in their heart, "There is no God." Science, poetry, art may accompany them through life, and give them many an hour of joy and pleasure; but these cannot heal the wounds of earth, nor give true peace to their better natures. There are faults, I say, on both sides. The Church in the past has much to answer for, because she refused to learn from science and culture how a beautiful full-sounding harmony runs through the whole complete Revelation of God, and that that Revelation, whether learned through the revealed Word, through nature, through history, or the inner conscience of man, is one. Nature, which is one book of God, does not unfold a different Revelation from that other Book in which He reveals His Will and work. The Church must learn to understand better the speech of the present, and to value the thoughts of the present. She must unlearn her uncultured denunciations of the unfaith of the world, when in fact the world is but waiting to be led on to more faith and more light.

But the Church bears not all the guilt. The high culture of intellect is apt to unfold and cherish intellectual pride, and pride most surely prepares a terrible chastisement. The heart, the unvanquished, unsubdued, unconquered heart rests upon itself; it wills, it suffers no interference; it resents the solemn monition to turn back, to retrace its steps, for this would be a confession of weakness, a confession of failure. It does not wish to be disturbed in the serene enjoyment of being, by the lofty earnestness of the Gospel, and the high-raised Cross. It is this harsh, austere, proud, self-assertion which is so hard to overcome. The human heart is more difficult of conquest than any fortress which kept the conquerors of the world at bay. But it has been well said, "There is a submission of thought that is not slavery, and there is a haughty mental independence which is not true freedom."

Of what avail are the cold denials of intellect? Even now and here another world casts its shadow across our path. Unillumined intellect confesses that all around is change and uncertainty, yet she offers nothing to us in place of that of which she tries to rob us. We need some solid facts on which to rest, she supplies us with mist; we need truths, she offers a hypothesis. A poet-philosopher of Germany draws in vivid colours an awful picture of a world in which God is dethroned and truth undermined; he says, "I saw a socket (empty, sightless, ghastly), where an eye had been, and I heard the shriek of a fatherless world." Thank God it was a dream; for though unaided intellect can give no answer to weary, perplexed, and famished souls that cry for knowledge and assurance of the Divine Fatherhood, yet faith can. Christianity responds to the supreme necessity of the soul. She gazes unfalteringly on the unseen and eternal. She is quite willing to suffer the loss of external things, as things indifferent, as things that soon must pass away, if only that upon which her hopes are set be left to her. When the heart is aching, and the spirit sinking, and the mind exhausted, and every power of our being unsatisfied, then faith supplies the only true restorative. She sends us to Christ. In Him we may find a solution to all our difficulties, a guide in the midst of much that we cannot understand, the source of every blessing really to be desired. This, I say, is what Christianity is doing, and has been doing for the past two thousand years. If she had not, would she not have ceased to command interest at the hands of those inquiring but deeply religious spirits who seek in religion not an amusement for a passing hour, but a kind friend, with a firm hand to guide through all the changes and chances of this world up to Him who changes not?

Here, then, is the reconciliation we spoke of, the Wisdom of God, which harmonises the present contradictions in life. Wise men and ignorant, noble and simple, young and old may come and kneel side by side and confess that in that which is too high for anyone to grasp, too deep to fathom, too vast for human intellect to comprehend, our Christianity has provided a clue by which all may

be guided, though darkness reigns around, all may be helped, though difficulties abound, till we be led through scenes in which we see in a mirror darkly, on to those other and brighter scenes, where we shall see face to face, and know even as also we are known.

One word, before closing, to you young men. Life is all before you. You are full of generous emotions and unselfish sacrifice. "From the young is to be expected the answer to all great questions. The world, in fact, belongs to the young—not merely the world to enjoy, but the world to fight; the future is in the shaping of their hands, theirs is the inheritance." But for you also time is short. The night will soon come. In an inconceivably short time old age will overtake you, and all the weaknesses that accompany old age. Therefore work while you have opportunity, while you have the daylight, while you have the energy and enthusiasm of youth. But work for that which will abide. Seek the peace, the joy, the love which alone can make this life blessed. Trust not to your own unaided powers in the great conflict, the great battle you will be compelled to fight. Christianity points you to One who is your Master, your Lord, your Saviour, your Friend. Welcome Him, accept Him as such, suffer Him to influence your hearts. Resolve to receive Him as your guide, and cherish Him as your Friend, even to the end. He will make you what it is your highest interest to be—in each succeeding age of life, childhood, youth, middle-age, and old age—gentle, pure, industrious, forgiving, generous, brave, and temperate. Cleave to Him, that by His abiding Presence, by His blessed Example, by the power and grace of His Holy Spirit, you may attain to that which unaided intellect has never dreamed of, and which mere teachers of morality have never thought out, a Christ-like life, the life lived by the Son of God.

THE Rev. W. F. Raymond, Prebendary of Wellington in Hereford Cathedral, died at Cheltenham, on the 14th inst., in the eighty-fifth year of his age.

BY the death of Mr. John Watson, J.P., at Nottingham, on March 13th, the Church generally and the diocese of Southwell in particular, has lost an earnest and liberal supporter. Early in life he identified himself with Church work in Nottingham, and for twenty years he served as parish churchwarden (Earl Manvers being vicar's churchwarden) of St. Mary's during the incumbency of the late Canon Morse, whose close friend he was, and whom he greatly assisted in the restoration of St. Mary's Church. He took a prominent part in the movement which resulted in the formation of the new see of Southwell, and became the first diocesan registrar and secretary to the Bishop, as well as continuing to be registrar of the archdeaconry of Nottingham. This work he thoroughly loved, and gave to it a deep knowledge of ecclesiastical law, a sound judgment, and a never-failing courtesy.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE,** or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW,** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary, **OBESITY IS CURED,** and will be sent, **gratis and post free,** on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.

(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1889.

THRIFT AND LIFE ASSURANCE.

FOR the Prudential Assurance Company to beat its previous record, as it has done by its last year's business, and done so completely, is, to say the least, a memorable fact in the history of life assurance in this country. With this Company there seems to be no finality. Those who are best acquainted with the conduct of life assurance affairs, and know how hard it is to forge ahead in the struggle for new business, will be the first to express surprise that the Prudential should by its own momentum, as it were, have made such unparalleled strides as it has done during many years past, and never more so than during the twelve months which ended on the 31st December last. The directors' report, which was presented to the annual meeting recently held at the office in Holborn Bars, though brevity itself, is unquestionably the most gratifying, as it is assuredly the most astounding, document ever presented to a body of shareholders in a life assurance company in this country. The Company's business is of a two-fold character—Ordinary Life Assurance and Industrial Life Assurance. Formerly, for many years, public and professional attention was directed mainly to the latter branch, in which the rapid progress made by the Prudential, which has the credit of having inaugurated the system of small assurances, was a common subject of conversation and wonderment. Now, although the Industrial Branch continues to progress as rapidly as ever, its marvellous development has been quite overshadowed by the still more marvellous growth and extension of the Ordinary Branch. In 1887 the number of policies issued in this department was

37,450, assuring £3,903,635, giving a new annual premium income of £192,109. Last year, 1888, the corresponding figures were 42,475 policies, for £4,399,769, at a new annual premium income of £235,487. Whilst the new premium income, therefore, was nearly a quarter of a million sterling —a fact altogether unprecedented in the annals of life assurance in Great Britain—the total premiums received during the year were £718,848, being an increase of £183,717 over the preceding year. The claims during the year, by 1,358 deaths and 52 endowment assurances, amounted to £210,056. There were at the end of the year 146,966 policies in force in the Ordinary Branch, and the average amount per policy is slightly over £100, assurances as low as £50 being included. There were, however, no fewer than 851 assurances last year for sums of £500 and upwards. It is worthy of note that the expenses remain at the low uniform rate of 10 per cent. on the premium income.

Turning to the Industrial Branch, the figures are no less remarkable. The total premiums received during the past year reached the extraordinary total of £3,256,346, being an increase of £197,845 over the the preceding year, when the increase over 1886 was £147,206. Last year's claims, arising from 142,751 deaths, absorbed £1,231,186. It is eminently satisfactory to find that the expenses in this branch are 1¼ per cent. lower than those of the previous year. They are, moreover, considerably within the margin of loading. At the close of the year there were in force no fewer than 8,063,293 policies, the average duration of which notwithstanding the vast number of new entrants within the past two or three years, is about six years. This, at all events, shows that industrial life assurance, so far at least as the Prudential is concerned, is by no means of a fugitive character. Every inducement is held out to the assured to remain in the office, and to this end it is gratifying to find that upwards of 40,000 free policies were granted during the year to policyholders of five years' standing who had desired to discontinue their payments. In this class there are 128,135 persons retained in benefit who, under a system less elastic and less liberal, would have forfeited their assurances. The Prudential has from time to time, when it has felt that additional favours could be safely conferred upon its clientèle, either by increased benefits or the removal of restrictions, not hesitated to adopt them. Guided by the light of experience, the directors of the Company, under the best possible professional advice, have built up a system of assurance surpassing the wildest dreams of the imagination—a system which, notwithstanding its widespread ramifications, is conducted with the regularity and precision of clockwork, conferring untold benefits upon thousands and thousands of thrifty families who find in it exactly what they need.

A large business implies large funds, and in this matter the Prudential is equally well favoured. During the year the assets of the company have been increased by £1,434,904, and now top nine and a quarter millions sterling! In this gigantic total is included the shareholders' capital; the Ordinary Branch fund of £2,819,098, and the Industrial Branch fund of £6,272,560. These funds, which are invested in the most approved securities, are set out in detail in a supplement to the report. British Government securities (Consols) amount to £1,188,068; railway and other debentures, £1,573,354; loans on municipal and other rates, £1,705,275; freehold ground rents, £1,757,089; mortgages, £853,796; and freehold and leasehold property, reversions, Bank of England stock, and so forth, make up the balance.

The Lancashire Insurance Company is another encourager of thrift, and deserving of the patronage of all philanthropists. It is a very safe and substantial office for life insurance. Established only in 1852, it has amassed a life reserve fund of £801,443 which is seven times its annual income of £114,506 from life premiums—a very sufficient reserve, which few, if any other offices of the same age possess.

One great cause of the success of the Prudential is unquestionably traceable to the fact of the unanimity which has always prevailed amongst the directors, officers, and the "rank and file." All have borne in mind that the *raison d'être* of the Prudential consists in the benefits it is able by wise administration to confer upon a community becoming more and more thrifty. All have pulled, and wisely pulled, in the same direction, and the result of this united energy is patent to the world.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Fourth Sunday in Lent.

Are we not very apt to be at times vague in our prayers; vague in our praises; vague in our self denunciation? Do we not sometimes, at least, ask for some blessing which we do not *really* want, simply because the asking for it has become a matter of habit? Do we not often praise God in general terms for His goodness to other people, while we forget altogether to thank Him for the special and precious mercy He has most lately bestowed upon *us?* And are we not wont to call ourselves "miserable sinners," without attaching any definite meaning to the phrase? Ruskin very well says in this connection: "When you are examining yourself never call yourself "a sinner"; that is very cheap abuse and utterly useless. You may even get to like it and be proud of it; but call yourself a liar, a coward, a sluggard, a glutton, or an evil-eyed jealous wretch, if you indeed find yourself to be in any wise any of these." Now we, in this week's Collect, own that for our "evil deeds" we "do worthily deserve to be punished." It is a solemn and serious admission to make; for we make it to Almighty God, who not only knows our sins, but who also sees how much we feel of what we say. Then let us be clear definite and sincere when we so speak: let us

review our life for the past week, and see which "evil deed" or "deeds" has had the upper hand. Have we, by word or action, been untrue? Have we, by saying or leaving unsaid, led others to false conclusions? If so, let us confess then this particular sin. Or, have we been wasting the precious gift of time, have we been idle? To the young this is, perhaps, a special temptation. They have not yet entered upon the serious business of life, and a few hours here and there seem to them of not much consequence: idleness does not appear a sin. Such ideas are false. Parents and teachers should endeavour to impress this upon their charges. Life is short. Satan is ever busy; and the idle fall an easy prey to his wiles. Or, are we jealous of what we think the superior future of our neighbour: discontented with our own lot? How can we be so foolish? Until we have carried our brother's cross—and that can never be—we cannot compare our lots at all. Can we not trust the All-seeing and All-loving God to do the best for His children? Let us, then, take our particular evil deed to Him, confessing humbly and sincerely our fault, and we know so great is His goodness towards us, that He will receive us with His blessing. He will bid us "go and sin no more"—a command which, with His help, we may *begin* to obey here, which we shall perfectly follow in the life to come. "By the comfort of His grace we shall mercifully be relieved."

MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

By Rev. BROWNLOW MAITLAND, M.A.

Paper Read at a Clerical Meeting.

At the Croydon Church Congress of 1883 the following words were placed by Professor Cheyne in the forefront of his address on this subject: "If the Anglican Church is ever to renovate her theology, and become in any real sense undeniably the Church of the future, she cannot afford to be careless or intolerant of attempts to modernise our methods of criticism and exegesis." I would adopt this sentence as the motto and apology for the following paper, in which I propose to take three of the best established results, of a general character, arrived at by modern Biblical research, and to suggest the practical advantages which may be gained by opening our minds to them.

1. Foremost among these results may be placed a much clearer recognition of the very gradual progress by which divine revelation advanced from a low, narrow, anthropomorphic beginning, to the comparatively high level of the prophetical Hebraisers—a progress not by leaps and bounds and sudden outbursts of light and knowledge, but by small stages, through the almost imperceptible fading away of materialising conceptions, the infusion of higher meanings into terms already familiar, the quickening of spiritual insight, and the elevation of the moral sense under divine training.

I call this a result of modern critical research, because it has been only through discoveries made in the course of that research as regards the growth and structure of the Old Testament that the slow development of revelation has come clearly to light. It is not to be got satisfactorily out of the Bible by merely taking the Bible as it stands. For what we have learnt is, that the Old Testament does not furnish on its face an orderly, chronological story of the origin and unfolding of religious knowledge; that its earliest books were composed long after the events which they report; and that, although they are founded on prior traditions and documents, they do not invariably reproduce the past in the way of absolute and unvarnished history, but often largely colour and modify the representation of it, so as to make it the vehicle of the later religious teaching. In this way it has come to pass that the more spiritual or moral conceptions of later times are mixed up with some of the earlier narratives, and whole codes of teaching have been bodily transferred to anterior epochs to which they do not historically belong. To discover the true order of progression thus became a task which nothing but the most learned and patient research could adequately perform.

2. Secondly, scientific criticism has fairly established the amalgamation in the Old Testament of three principal and successive codes, recensions, or groups of documents, exhibiting the steps by which it grew up and attained its actual shape. What we learn from an exhaustive examination of the documents themselves, aided and checked by our new sources of historical knowledge, may be described broadly as follows. The literary composition of the Old Testament appears not to have begun till after the establishment of the monarchy, the preceding era having been one of floating traditions, fragmentary codes and chronicles, and other local or fugitive records. Out of these pre-existing materials, under the handling of the prophetical school, which during the monarchy probably contained most of the literary ability that advancing civilisation brought with it, there gradually grew up what may be described as the primary continuous Biblical narrative. Beginning with the origin of the human race as given in Gen. ii. and iii., it embraced the antediluvian and patriarchal times, the bondage in Egypt, followed by the exodus and wandering, the conquest of Canaan, the rude administration of the Judges, the creation of the monarchy, and its subsequent course as told in the two Books of the Kings. This may be designated as the foundation document of the Old Testament, the work of many successive authors and compilers, who gathered up the floating traditions, worked in materials borrowed from anterior records, and steeped the whole in the religious knowledge and sentiment of their own times. Next after this, but overlapping the latest portion of it, must be placed the composition, probably by several successive writers, of the Book of Deuteronomy—that "wonderful manual of an Israelite's duty towards God and his neighbour," by which Josiah's great reformation of religion was inaugurated and upheld. But not till after the return from Babylon did the Old Testament receive its present form, as well as its completion by later writers. The two already existing documents or codes, the historical and the Deuteronomic, were edited and supplemented by the school of the scribes under priestly superintendence; the traditional ceremonial practices were codified and expanded in the complex Levitical law; and by the amalgamation of this new code with the preceding Deuteronomic code, and the earlier portion of the historical document, the Pentateuch was constructed, the cosmogony of Gen. i. being prefixed to it as a noble preface. Then a supplementary history of the monarchy was written from a priestly point of view in the two Books of the Chronicles; the Temple hymn-book was gradually formed by collecting such sacred lyrics as had escaped

the ravages of war and captivity, modifying not a few of them for present needs, and largely augmenting their number; the surviving utterances of the prophets were gathered and arranged as accurately as the imperfect tradition of their authorship and chronology permitted; and lastly, the sapiential books, composed in part out of existing materials, were added to the sacred literature. Thus, at length, in the course probably of the second century B.C., the Old Testament, speaking broadly, assumed the form in which it is presented to us in the LXX. version.

Such in outline is the story of the Genesis of the Old Testament which modern research presents to us, leaving, of course, still doubtful many minor details. The central fact in it, and perhaps the most startling to the older school of interpretation, is the late construction of the Pentateuch out of documents of widely different ages. Yet this, in the judgment not merely of the great foreign critics, but also of our own foremost experts in these studies, is established beyond all reasonable doubt. Professor Cheyne may be said to speak for them all when he says: "If exegesis, or the Church's representation of religious truth, is to make any decided progress, the results of the literary analysis of the Pentateuch must be accepted as facts, and theologians must in future recognise at least three different sections, and as many different conceptions of Israel's religious development within the Pentateuch."

3. The third result I will mention concerns the predictive element in the Bible. It has been expressed in the phrase that "a prophet's horizon is that of his own time, and although he prophesies into the future, he does not prophesy directly to the future." This means that the prophets were primarily the moral and religious teachers of their own generation, and that when, on comparatively rare occasions, they did under divine inspiration utter real predictions, they were not —to use Canon Driver's words—predictions relating to some remote future, without interest or signification for the prophet's own contemporaries, but predictions declaring the issue of a present political complication, or announcing beforehand some coming event, especially when the event had a bearing on the progress of the divine kingdom. Not that sober criticism is adverse to the far-reaching Messianic outlook of many of the prophetical utterances, or underrates the permanent value of the seer's words, even when predicting long-past events of no concern to ourselves. But it teaches us that the Messianic significance is not direct or primary, but is a result of the fact that Israel was the Messianic nation, whose aspirations, sufferings, and triumphs were mystical or typical as well as historical; and that the permanent value of prophecy rests on the truth that, though the forms of the divine action vary with the world's development, the wisdom, righteousness, and grace which animate it continue unchanged. True exegesis distinguishes between the letter and the spirit of ancient prophecy, and tells us that it is the spirit, not the bare letter, which is the testimony of Jesus.

II. Having mentioned these three results of modern scientific criticism, it remains for me to point out some of the practical advantages of opening our minds to them.

1. We get rid entirely of the increasing difficulty of defending the Old Testament against sceptics, on the assumption of its perfect self-consistency and infallibility. We need no longer be driven to the irrational allegorising of the fathers, or the dishonest evasions of the moderns, to help us over the manifest stumbling-blocks. Room is made for the admission of any amount of historical inaccuracy, ignorance of natural science, self-contradiction, imperfect morality or theology, that may be proved against the Old Testament, without shaking in the smallest degree our confidence that it contains a priceless record of divine guidance, development, and preparation for the Gospel. The past, on the contrary, becomes to us more credible because more truly human, and more in accordance with what we learn of the divine methods from history and science.

2. We obtain a wider and loftier view of what inspiration really is. It ceases to be a synonym of verbal infallibility, to denote an operation confined to a few and rarely found channels, or to mean an influence which overbears the mind and reduces it to a machine. We better recognise it as a divine breath quickening religious souls with an insight above their fellows, and animating them to utter what of God's gift is in them for the guidance and improvement of their generation. We are enabled to perceive it under a thousand forms, carrying with it, indeed, a measure of the manifold ignorances and imperfections of the surrounding world, yet justifying its supernatural origin by its power to reach the conscience and claim men for God. Inspiration thus becomes more truly human to us without becoming less divine.

3. A due perspective and proportion are introduced into our view of the sacred documents. So long as every part of the Bible is considered as equally authoritative, it is difficult to vindicate the supreme authority and grandeur of the Christian revelation. We need to have the Old Testament put back into its proper subordinate place as the record of rudimentary lessons, dim foreshadowings, painful strivings after knowledge, faltering steps through the twilight, that we may adequately rejoice in the dayspring from on high, the rising of the Sun of righteousness, the grace and truth of the Only-Begotten coming out of the eternal Bosom to manifest the Father to the world. Not all the words of Israel's prophets and scribes massed together are worth a single saying of Christ's. Not of Moses, or David, or Isaiah, but of Him only can it be affirmed: "Thou hast the words of eternal life."

4. Lastly, our theology will be simplified, purged, and set on surer foundations. The more firmly we grasp the idea of the progressiveness of the earlier revelation, the more impossible we shall find it to look on its record as "a Gospel in riddles," or to treat it as a quarry from which to hew out texts to build up Christian doctrines; the less shall we yield to the temptation to read back New Testament ideas into Old Testament phraseology, and then triumphantly bring out the Old Testament phraseology to prove the New Testament ideas. We shall give up the endeavour to found our doctrines of Christ's priesthood and atonement on the Levitical conceptions of sacrifice, and to supplement Apostolic teaching about the sacraments by the utterances or actions of patriarch, prophet, or priest of the ancient days. It will become plain to us that neither are the shadowy anticipations of Hebrew saints any safe materials out of which to weave theories of the intermediate state, nor their declarations of the fate of the rebellious any real ground of knowledge respecting the ultimate purposes of God. The Apocalyptic literature and the phraseology derived from it will fall into their proper place as emblematic of partial phases of the conflict between

good and evil in the temporal sphere, and will cease to be misused as dogmatic revelations of the eternal issues to which the world is being guided. The romances of our modern prophets, their elaborate calculations of times and seasons, their audacious forecasting of the fortunes of nations and churches, and of the self-manifestations of the eternal King, will die a natural death, and it will be no longer possible for us to be asked gravely to believe, on the authority of some Apocalyptic enigma, such things as that the period of the Church's consummation is determined by the measurement of a gallery within the pyramid of Cheops, or that the resurrection of the just shall take place on Thursday, 5th March, 1896, at 3 p.m. And lastly, in our general use of the Holy Scriptures, we shall be less slaves of the letter, and shall drink more deeply into the spirit; we shall be better trained to judge between what is temporary and what is eternal —between what is expedient and what is essential— between the human incrustation and the divine substance. We shall rise more into the freedom and discernment of men who have put away childish things, and we shall escape the danger of that blessed book, which ought to reveal to us our God and Father, becoming by misuse an obstruction between Him and our hearts.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE SIGN OF JONAH THE PROPHET.

SIR,—I have not been disappointed in receiving valuable instruction from "Presbyter" respecting the book of Jonah. His speculation—I do not know if it be original with him or not, but it is entirely new to me—that Jonah is a figure of the spiritual history of Israel is most interesting and attractive. It is not the less so, because it is perfectly consistent both with the supposition that the book is an apologue, and with the strictly historical theory of the book. On the question between those opposite views I have nothing to offer; there are evidently substantial difficulties in both.

Mr. Murphy says that we ought not to shut our eyes to difficulties, but to choose such explanations as offers the fewest and smallest; that is, I so understand him. The difficulty of supposing our Lord to illustrate His own ressurrection from an apologue, not absolute historic fact, I endeavoured in my last to show not to be a difficulty at all. "C.P.M.'s" argument that our Lord, in speaking of Himself as *a sign*, must almost certainly, even had we no report of His utterance but that in St. Luke, have referred to his rising from the dead, seems to me nearly conclusive. If it be not conclusive, it at least suggests a difficulty in any other interpretation. But there is another difficulty, not exactly of the same kind.

It is a maxim of evidence, that a contradiction of one credible witness by another does not overthrow the testimony of the first, as mere matter of course; and it is a further maxim, that a contradiction. of the form, "It is not so, because I did not see it, or did not hear it," is not a contradiction at all, the two witness being equal in credit. Accordingly, a full report is commonly to be accepted as not contradictory, but supplementary, of a meagre report, unless there be matters which the rejection of the full report will explain. I submit that there is no inconsistency to be explained, in the omission by St. Luke, of the matter of the 40th verse of Matthew xii.

Further, the imagination of the people of the first century would be turned, by the mere mention of Jonah, as the imagination of the people of the present would too, much rather to his deliverance from the sea, than to his mission to Nineveh; and had our Lord not spoken of Jonah as St. Matthew relates, His audience would have been apt to think there was some mysterious and inexplicable allusion. He made allusion to two instances of faith; the Queen of Sheba's reverence for the wise king, and the repentance of the Ninevites. But He did not say that Solomon was *a sign;* on the contrary, He said that *no sign* but Jonah would be at that time given. This indicates that Jonah was a sign in something more than by his preaching. "C.P.M.," however, has handled this more convincingly than I can do. EDMUND LAWRENCE.

23rd March.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bullinger, Rev. Ethelbert William, D.D., Chaplain of Byfleet Hall and of Princess Mary Village Homes, Addlestone.
Clarke, Rev. T., Curate-in-Charge; Vicar of Brockenhurst, Hants.
Cowan, Rev. C. E. R., Vicar of Weston, near Bath; Rector of St. Gerran's, Cornwall.
Cummings, Rev. Alfred James Hayman, Chaplain of Moulsford Lunatic Asylum, Berks.
Gallagher, Rev. J., Curate-in-Charge of St. John's, Kettleshulme-with-Saltersford.
Green, Rev. David, M.A., Perpetual Curate of All Saints', Battersea Park.
Hales, Rev. George, Rector of Barningham, Yorks, and Rural Dean of North Richmond; Rector of Rickinghall Inferior, Suffolk.
Hamilton-Gell, Rev. Fielding Arthur Wolfe, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Hewson, Rev. Henry Newington Clarke, Rector of Higham Gobion, Bedfordshire.
Hill, Rev. E., M.A., Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge; Rector of Cockfield, Suffolk.
Hingston, Rev. Richard Edward Hull, Vicar of St. Paul's, Clapham.
Hodgson, Ven. F. R., late Archdeacon of Zanzibar; to the Charge of Lympstone, Devonshire.
Howell, Rev. Frederick Broke, M.A., Rector of Upwey, Dorchester

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Cooley, Rev. William L. J., M.A., Vicar of Pontelond, Northumberland, and Hon. Canon of Newcastle, suddenly, on the 22nd inst., aged 56.
Groome, Ven. Robert Hindes, for eighteen years Archdeacon of Suffolk, and for forty-four Rector of Monk Soham, on the 19th inst., aged 79.
Hall, Rev. William Cradock, M.A., Queen's College, Oxford, Vicar of Pilton for fifty years, at Pilton Vicarage, North Devon, on the 24th inst., aged 86.
Halpin, Rev. Robert Crawford, Chaplain to the Forces and to H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, at 22, Belsize Square, on the 19th inst.
Hinton, Rev. George Stephen, for sixteen years Rector of Upton Cressett, at Upton Cressett Rectory, Bridgenorth, on the 20th inst.
Smith, Rev. P. Parker, St. James's Place, Plymouth, late Vicar of Stanwich St. John's, Darlington, retired Chaplain R.N., on the 20th inst., aged 77.
Whitworth, Rev. Thomas, at Thorpe St. Peters, Lincolnshire, on the 13th inst., aged 82.
Yolland, Rev. John, M.A., at the Vicarage, Hoylake, Cheshire, on the 18th inst., in his 58th year.

The Church of England Pulpit.

"NOW."

By the Rev. R. C. NUGENT KELLY, M.A.,
English Chaplain at Gothenburg.

Sermon Preached at Gothenburg, on Sunday, January 6th, 1889.

"Behold, NOW is the accepted time; behold, NOW is the day of salvation."—2 Cor. vi., part of ver. 2.

THE whole force of this truth lies in the one word, "Now." Now! now! is the supreme moment. On this single word of my text alone do I propose to speak. "Behold NOW is the accepted time; behold NOW is the day of salvation."

Christ and His Gospel are for the present moment. Mahommed, Buddha, the modern religious philosophers, send you further and further into the dim realms of futurity for their inspiring strength. The Church of Rome sends you wandering among the graves of the past. But the simple Gospel in its Master's own simplest words is the Gospel of the present moment. "The kingdom of God IS within you." "He that believeth in Me HATH everlasting life." "Blessed ARE the 'poor,' the 'meek,' the 'pure in heart.'" And in the great prayer He teaches us to say—as the utmost stretch of our requirements—"Give us this day our daily bread."

All this St. Paul in his wonderfully vivid manner throws into the one striking, masterful word, Now. Now is the day of salvation.

First, let us take this truth and see some of the ways in which it may help faithful and true believers on the Lord Jesus, and then how it may help all to become such.

I. My brother Christian: you call Christ Lord and Master; you thank God humbly and fervently that the light of the glorious Gospel has shone into your heart; you take courage from finding that your feet grow accustomed to treading this way of life; you gain self-confidence, and you no longer are timidly feeling your next step. And though at the beginning of another new year you feel the solemnity of passing time, yet as you look back you can say, "It is now so many years since the Gospel of Christ Jesus my Saviour became the word of my salvation; so many years ago did I look first with my whole heart at the Cross of Christ, and see my sins covered and my pardon assured." But, my brother, what about this year? What about this day? What of thy NOW? Is the faith of that ever-pressing NOW as real, as true, as self-forgetful as the faith which sixteen or ten or twenty years ago led you to "forget those things which were behind and press towards the mark," towards the salvation and hope and peace you then saw in the face of the blessed Saviour?

There is no more insidious poison mingled with the daily food of the Christian soul by the adversary of man and God, than that soothing drug, the habit of complacently looking back to the time when you first trusted yourself to the way of life, and drawing consolation from that fact. Friends, do that, and you may sink into idolatry before you know it, and the idol will be the dead husk of a dead faith. The faith which saves and purifies the soul is *not faith in your own faithfulness*, but faith in Christ. Nor even is it *faith in the faith you once had*, but your salvation this day is just according to your faith this day.

The present moment is the measure of your state before God. This day is always the sum of all the previous days. If you have come once, dear fellow believer, to the foot of the Cross; if you have once looked up from that lowly place into the face of the Redeemer; if you have once got peace and hope and forgiveness from your Saviour there, then come back again and again for the same free grace to meet the same sore need. Last year you sought forgiveness for the sins of last year. Yes. But now, here, this moment, you want forgiveness for the sins you have perhaps unconsciously committed in this short service even.

Here is the full glorious richness of the mercy of our God. Live always under the protection of the Cross of Christ. It reaches not only to the ground whereon you stood so eagerly when you first sought its life-giving inspiration; it reaches to the very uttermost limits of your life. "Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them."

You needed your Saviour to forgive you your past, years ago. You then saw clearly that apart from Christ, out of Christ, without Christ, you were a sinner; basely, shamefully, helplessly a sinner. But what about the NOW? Are you not even now—am not I who speak to you as the ambassador of Christ—are we not NOW just such sinners needing forgiveness, basely, shamefully, helplessly sinners? Yes, *without Christ*. But if I am in Christ NOW, I am cleansed by Him, NOW, from my guilt, which I should otherwise NOW be ready to sink under. It is what you are and where you are NOW, not what you were and where you were yesterday, which is the important question. Judas was once among the disciples who had left all to follow Him. Zaccheus had been one of the unjust publicans.

Seek, then, ye who have found your Christ gracious, seek to let it be ever NOW between you

and your Saviour. Go through your life, do your duty, take the good gifts from God, brave the trials, endure the hardness of the way, enjoy the blessings of life just as they come; but let it be with your heart lightened and invigorated by the thought that "Now"—"Now is the day of your salvation;" NOW is the blood of Jesus Christ cleansing you from all sin; NOW are you accepted in the Beloved; NOW are you one with Christ and Christ with you.

2. But, friends, this truth is linked by natural sequence to another.

Let it be true that the Gospel of the grace and mercy of Christ is always for the "Now"—that the goodness and mercy of God follow you and cover you from moment to moment as well as from year to year. Take heart from the largeness of God's Now. It is the source of much happiness and freedom. But add its counterpart, the NOW of practical Christianity.

How much Christianity—how much Christ-likeness—is visible in me now? What, so far, is the outcome of your faith? When do you expect to begin to reap the fruits of Christianity? When do you propose to serve your Lord fully and faithfully?

Behold NOW is the accepted time, NOW is the moment when your faith is to show itself. We are always ready to persuade ourselves that IF certain circumstances were a little different, THEN we should be able to do great things. But what God looks for is to see great things done under the stress of *present* circumstances.

We could all live holy if temptation were not so subtle. The grand thing is to live holy NOW, just when temptation is most subtle.

Take this word "Now" with you, fellow-soldiers of the Cross of Christ, and it will sound like a trumpet-call to duty. Here in this church you seek the presence of God; the day of salvation is, you feel truly, this present day. To-morrow, in the midst of the world's duties and pleasures let the same thought echo and re-echo in your heart. When the mind seems like to forget itself, and the thought of God and His truth and His purity and His holiness is growing dim, call back your wavering faith by this masterful voice of truth, "Now is the accepted time. Now is the moment to let the Gospel of my Lord shine bright and clear on my path. Now is the time to strike a good manly blow against one more lie of society. Now is the time to speak the one word needed to help a soul to light. Now is the time to serve my Lord by confessing and holding to His way." For just as the covering mercy of Christ is always with the faithful, just as the day of Christ's saving them is always this day, always NOW; so, again, is the day of their serving Christ always this day, this day and no other. That you served Him yesterday and last year: that is good; thank God for it. That you hope and purpose to serve Him to-morrow and next year: that is good also. But the great good thing, the best and surest thing, is that you serve Him to-day, NOW, at once.

3. Further; *live by the present grace.* There is nothing harder in the Christian life, I am sure, than just to take its simplest axiom, and live bravely and calmly in the strength of it. "The just shall live by faith." That we allow. We "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," and look for life from Him. We believe that He forgives us our sins. We believe that He will be faithful to the end. We believe that He will receive us at last to Himself, to be with Him and to be like Him. We trust Him for the *foundation* of our faith; we trust Him for the *final completion*, but we find it so strangely difficult to rely utterly and absolutely upon His *skill and faithfulness in the mere details of life, in the monotonous adding of brick to brick and stone to stone.* For life in general, and for heaven at last, we may look unfalteringly to Him; but for the little "NOWS" of life, for this next moment, for those simple, unexciting trifles of mundane existence by which nevertheless our salvation is assuredly being wrought out—there we falter.

Yet Christ is saving you just as much in the daily "NOW" as He will be in the eternal "then." It is just as important, every bit as important, that you should be living in prayer, walking in holiness, purified in spirit, zealous in good works, at peace with God, "NOW," in the bustle of business, in the ordinary pleasures and duties of social life, as it will be "then" when you are lying on your last sick-bed, and your "NOW" is the "NOW" of eternity. Friends, I know that this is not a popular doctrine. I know that it is not thought well to speak of living as if it were as important as dying; but I am well content to abide by what I have said, for the whole spirit of the Bible is on my side. Not some far-off day; not some particular, uncertain moment at the close of life is the day of salvation; but NOW, every moment of every day, and every day of the whole life is your soul to be saved, and your spirit made fit for the presence of God.

II. Just one word more. There are those who are always hovering on the border of the kingdom of heaven, and there are those who, while never going utterly out of sight of that kingdom, nevertheless say in their hearts: "Not yet, not yet is my accepted time; not yet is my day of salvation."

These are they who wait for a more convenient season—THEN will they open, they say, and let Christ into their hearts. But, friend, who ever gave thee leave to build upon any THEN? The past is beyond your reach; the future is beyond your grasp; the present moment, the great NOW, is well within your power. Now is your day of salvation; NOW is your accepted time. Now is Christ ready to save; NOW is He ready to receive you. To-morrow is not yours. To-morrow the day of grace may have passed. "To DAY, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts."

For you need this Saviour; you need this presence of the Holy Spirit; you need this love of the great Father not only to-morrow, but to-day and every day. The Christian's rule of life is (in all its varied fulness of application), "As ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in Him."

Inasmuch as yesterday was a day of salvation to us, so in like manner have we need of a like grace to-day. Whether, therefore, friends, you have known this our Christ well and truly for long years past, or know Him not, yet, in very truth at all; to each one of us is there the same need and the same hope for this the PRESENT moment. "Behold NOW is the accepted time; behold NOW is the day of salvation."

THE OFFICE OF A DEACON.

By the Rev. JAMES HEWITT, M.A., Incumbent of Zion Church, Rathgar, Dublin.

Sermon Preached in Sandford Church, Dublin, at the Ordination of Mr. Warren as Deacon, by the Archbishop of Dublin, to be Curate of Sandford, January 20th, 1889.

"For they that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree and great boldness in the faith which is in Jesus Christ."—1 Tim. iii. 13.

MY Beloved Brethren,—You are permitted through the kindness of the Archbishop to witness and to take part in a deeply interesting and solemn service this morning—the ordination to the office of Deacon of him who is to assist your pastor in ministering the Gospel among you. I cannot but hope that the holding of this ordination here in the midst of the people to whom he is to minister will be very helpful to our dear brother, who is coming among you, and prove a bond of sympathy, union, and love between him and you. And I pray God to enable me to say something to deepen the impression which this service ought to produce. My subject is prescribed for me in the rubric before the Ordination Service. I am to speak of the duty and office of such as come to be admitted Deacons, how necessary that office is in the Church of Christ, and how the people ought to esteem them in their office. These are just the subjects to which our text directs attention: I. There is the office of Deacon authorized by the apostle. II. The duties of the office, needing to be well discharged. III. The good degree or standing which they that use the office well gain for themselves.

I. It is evident from our text that the office of Deacon is one for which we have *apostolic authority*. Timothy at Ephesus was to ordain such by laying on of hands, and to judge of their qualifications before he ordained them, just as our modern Diocesan Bishops do. Indeed, I cannot understand how anyone can read this Epistle, and that to Titus, without perceiving that in the apostle's time there were three distinct orders of ministers—Timothy at Ephesus and Titus in Crete, invested with authority over the church, and over the ministers of the Church; Bishops, also called Elders (v. 17; Titus i. 5, 6), who were pastors and teachers of the flock; and Deacons, who were subordinate to them, and helped them in their work. The necessity for the office of deacon arose early in the Church at Jerusalem. At first the apostles discharged all the duties of the ministry themselves. They preached the Gospel, they conducted Divine worship, they visited from house to house, they looked after the common fund, and administered temporal relief; but complaints arose that certain poor pensioners were neglected in the daily distribution; and then the apostles called upon the disciples to look out for seven men full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom they appointed and set apart by prayer and laying on of hands to this subordinate ministry, or diaconate, of relieving the poor. But they would not be confined to that work; their qualifications as men full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom pointed to a higher service; they would witness for Christ. We find one of them, Stephen, immediately preaching with great power, working great miracles, silencing his Jewish adversaries, and laying down his life, the first martyr for Christ. We find another of them, Philip, preaching the Gospel in Samaria with much success, and known later on as an evangelist with a settled home in Cæsarea (Acts xxi. 8). And it is evident from Philip. i. 1, and from our text, that the office of Deacon became a regular recognised order in the ministry, subordinate to that of Elders (who were also called Bishops), but not the less on that account an office of dignity, responsibility, and usefulness.

II. The duties assigned to Deacons in our Church seem to me to correspond with those discharged by the original Deacons, and to require men full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom to discharge them aright. They are six in number; you will hear them specified later on in the service, when our brother will be asked is he prepared to fulfil them. 1. The Deacon is to assist the Presbyter in Divine Service, and ministering the Holy Communion. We contract the title Presbyter into Priest, meaning thereby not one who holds a sacerdotal office, or pretends to offer sacrifice to God, like the Jewish Priest; but one who as an elder ministers the Word, leads the flock, and watches for souls, as one who must give account. To assist him in conducting Divine Service aright, the Deacon must be full of the Holy Ghost; he must *pray* the prayers in his heart, not merely gabble them over with his lips, if he would impress others with the thought that we are praying to God. 2. He is to read the Holy

Scriptures in the Church, and if he would read them so as to make the people feel that they are listening to the Word of God containing a message for them there and then from the living God, he must be full of the Holy Ghost. 3. He is to teach the Catechism to the young; and surely, if he would teach young hearts to know their need of the Saviour, to trust in the Lord Jesus as their Redeemer, and follow Him as their Lord and Master, he must be full of the Holy Ghost. 4. He is to baptize infants, and if he is to do this rightly and well, not as if the mere external ordinance must necessarily avail, but as the visible sign and seal of the admission of believers into union with Christ, which believing parents are privileged to claim for their infant children, as well as themselves, he ought to be full of faith and of the Holy Ghost. 5. He is to preach the Gospel if he be admitted to do so by the Bishop. This is the highest of all his duties, higher even than administering the Sacraments. This is what old Herbert calls the parson's joy and throne, the most blessed, the most important of all his functions—to speak as an ambassador for Christ; to proclaim that Christ died for our sins, and that through Him there is forgiveness for all who believe; to beseech men to be reconciled to God, and then to build them up in their most holy faith, and lead them on the way to heaven; oh, it is a most blessed office, but it needs a man full of the Holy Ghost. 6. And even what we might regard as the lowest duty of the Deacon, the one for which they were first set apart, the searching out the poor and sick, and administering temporal relief to them—is not unimportant, for Christ cares for the poor; God has chosen the poor in this world, rich in faith, and heirs of His kingdom; and to minister to their wants in body and soul will need wisdom, love, sympathy, and tenderness—will need a man full of the Holy Ghost.

Before he be admitted to the discharge of such solemn duties, the Deacon, according to the apostle's direction in this chapter (verse 10), must first be proved; and our Church requires very stringent proving. He must obtain a certificate from three well-known clergymen, of soundness in the faith, holiness in life, and general fitness; his fellow-parishioners are asked if they know anything to disqualify him; he is examined by the Bishop and his chaplains; and finally you will hear the solemn question put to himself: "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office?" And you will hear him reply, "I trust so." Now, no one can give this reply truthfully who does not believe that the great change has taken place in his own heart, that he has been born again of the Spirit, that he has come as a sinner to the Saviour, and received from Him the forgiveness of sins and eternal life, and obtained the gift of the Holy Ghost to dwell in Him as his Comforter, Sanctifier, Helper, and Guide—yea, more, that he has been so constrained by the love of Christ to desire the work of the ministry, and to give himself wholly to it, that he can attribute it to nothing else but the moving of the Holy Ghost. The man truly called of God is the man who esteems the service of Christ above all human dignities, and would prefer to be a good minister of Jesus Christ rather than to be Prime Minister of England.

III. And now, in what esteem should such a man be held? The apostle says: "They purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith." Some suppose this means that they become entitled to be advanced to the higher degree of Presbyter; and no doubt it is true that to serve well as a Deacon is the best preparation for the higher and more responsible office of pastor of a flock. But I scarcely think that this is the meaning of our text. The Revised Version translates: "They that have served well as deacons gain to themselves a good standing," etc. This may mean either in the esteem of man, or in the approbation of God, and great boldness either in witnessing before men, or in the prospect of the Master's coming. And truly the approbation of God is the faithful minister's first and greatest reward, and next to it is the love and esteem of his people. Great are the trials of the minister, but great also are these joys. Now, if you want to know how God would have you to esteem your ministers, turn to 1 Thess. v. 12, 13, and 25. Here three things are enjoined: (1) that you *know* them, that is, recognise them in their office, acknowledge them as the ministers of Christ, receive them gladly, welcome them cordially; (2) that you esteem them very highly in love, for their Master's sake and their work's sake; that you feel with them and for them, value their ministry, and be not too ready to mark defects, but rather throw the cloak of love over their imperfections, and help them as you can; (3) that you pray for them. Much of the blessing you receive depends upon the prayers you offer. I beseech you be not mere spectators of the service that is to follow. Throw your whole hearts into it, help with your prayers; and not only pray now for him who is about to be ordained, but give him a place in your daily supplications side by side with your beloved pastor, and so may you expect God to make him a great blessing in this place.

ERRATUM.—In last Number on p. 154, in the 19th line of Rev. Brownlow Maitland's paper, the word "Hebraisers" should be "Hebraism."

BY the generosity of Mrs. J. Y. Gibson, an annual prize for undergraduates has been founded at Cavendish College, Cambridge, to encourage the study of the Greek Testament. An examination will be held at this college on July 23 for eight scholarships. The subjects of the examination will be classics, mathematics, natural science, and modern languages, and the scholarships will be awarded for proficiency in any of these subjects.

CHRISTIAN HOPEFULNESS.

By the Rev. R. DIXON, Curate of Eastwood.

Sermon Preached in St. Stephen's Church, Rotherham, on April 18th, 1885.

"Delight thyself (also) in the Lord; and He shall give thee the desires of thine heart. . . . Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for Him."—Ps. xxxvii. 4 and (part of) 7.

I WISH to say a few words this morning on "Christian Hopefulness."

This wonderful Psalm, from which the text is taken, was written by David in his old age: "I have been young and now am old," he says. It is the result, therefore, of a life-long as well as a varied experience—first in the retirement and quietude of pastoral life; then as warrior, king, and legislator. The Psalmist seems, as the aged are wont to do, to have been wandering back over the past, to have been studying the dealings of Providence with mankind during his own lifetime. His experience he records in this Psalm. And where would we look to find a more varied experience than that of David's? He had seen life under almost all its eventful phases. He had lived for many years the quiet, simple life of a Judean shepherd in his father's farmstead. After his slaughter of the giant Goliath of Gath, at once the enemy and terror of his country, he had enjoyed the halo and glory attaching to a great warrior: "Saul hath slain his thousands and David his ten thousands," was the jubilant song of his countrywomen. He enjoyed for a time the luxury and splendour of a king's palace. He knew what it was to endure the hardships, the hunger, the fatigue, and dangers of an outlaw and fugitive. He had experienced the delights and the uneasiness, the pomp and the weight, of a royal crown. He was the hero of many a long campaign and of almost innumerable pitched battles. He had nipped in the bud many a subtle plot, he had crushed many a deep conspiracy. He had been a great sinner and a deep repentant. David was no mere sentimentalist, but a practical matter-of-fact man. And now in his old age, looking back over his past life and recalling all his past experiences of God's dealings with men, he seeks—

"To assert eternal Providence,
And justify the ways of God to men."

He expounds in this Psalm the great riddle of the prosperity of the wicked, and the affliction of the righteous. He had "seen the wicked in great power, and spreading himself like a green bay-tree." "Their eyes stand out with fatness: and they have more than heart could wish." "Behold, these are the ungodly, who prosper in the world! they increase in riches." But what was the end of it all? "Yet he passed away, and lo, he was not: yea, I sought him, but he could not be found." "Surely thou didst set them," says David, "in slippery places: thou castedst them down into destruction. How are they brought into desolation in a moment! They are utterly consumed with terrors." But as for the righteous, "The end of that man is peace." "The Lord knoweth the days of the upright; and their inheritance shall be for ever."

David, we say, was taking a survey of the past; and although the sands of life were well nigh run out, yet his words are full of joy and hopefulness: "Delight thyself in the Lord"; "Rest in the Lord"; "Wait patiently for Him." "Delight!"—"rest!"—"wait patiently!" Surely these are not the expressions of despair or gloom. Old age had not brought sourness or moroseness to David, but deep confidence in God and hopefulness of the future. The sun of his natural existence was fast sinking in the Western sky; but with the eye of faith he already beholds, above the horizon, "the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings," that sun which never sets. "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory." If there is a picture on this earth more beautiful than another, it is the picture of saintly old age. The snow-white locks seem an earnest and pledge of the white robes of righteousness which they are soon to wear. The kindly smile and glistening features seem to reflect a light no longer of this earth but of heavenly radiance, like the face of Moses after he had been on the top of the mount alone with God. The impetuosity and restlessness of youth, the bitter disappointment and fretfulness at apparent failure, have given place to the sweet resignation, the peace and hope of old age. As the aged saint looks back over the past he sees, like David, "how things which began badly have turned out well, and things that were distressing have turned to good for so many people, and how good has been coming perpetually out of evil. His past experience makes him hopeful; and so, very often, we find the aged Christian, who is very near the grave, far more hopeful about himself, not only about the things to come, but about the world as it is now than the young man who is just entering upon life."*

Let us try then to learn a few lessons of comfort and hopefulness which this cheery old saint of Israel has to teach us in this thirty-seventh Psalm. In those bad times, as we say, when men are not only not saving money, but perhaps drawing on their accumulations of past years, and are in fear and despondency for the future, it may be, as to their ability to give their children a fair start in life—in those times the Psalmist would seem to say a hopeful word: 'Rest in the Lord, have faith in God. I have had long experience of God's ways of dealing with mankind. I have been young and now am old, yet have I never seen the

* Archbishop of Canterbury.

righteous forsaken nor his seed begging bread. Do good, and, as to the future, trust God. As regards your children, if you can't leave them a fortune, put one into them in the shape of principles of integrity and uprightness, of independence of character and simplicity of habits, and leave the rest with God. Children reared in this way,' the Psalmist seems to say, 'do not come to want. That is my experience.'

To you who are feeling in your inmost heart, although you may not have expressed the thought in words even to yourself—'If I were able to live in a house so large, to adorn it so costly, to have clothes so fine, to have an equipage so imposing, to appear before my neighbours in such and such a fashion, I should be contented'—to you he seems to say, 'Contentment, happiness, is found in none of these things. Listen to me. I have had long experience of the most varied kind. I have lived a homely-life in a farm-house; I have dwelt in a palace; I have worn a royal crown. And this is my experience. A little that a righteous man hath is better than the riches of many wicked. There is more happiness in the godly dinner of herbs than in the stalled ox of profane rioters.' The source of happiness is not in externals: it is in yourselves. In your own heart is the fount of happiness or misery, and not in your surroundings. 'Content finds *multum in parvo*, while for a wicked heart the whole world is too little.' 'The consciousness of righteous dealing, a conscience void of offence toward God and man; these, with the humblest externals,' David seems to say, 'give greater happiness than the splendour of the wicked.' 'Delight thyself in the Lord.' God must be the object of thy aspirations and longings. Then will thy chastened and subdued will seek these things which please God, and so 'shall He give thee the desires of thine heart.'

"Rest in the Lord" from anxiety and fear as to the present success and ultimate triumph of the Gospel of Christ. In those days of the worship of numbers and statistics, of parade and so-called results, in those days of unseemly competition and rivalry among churches and sects, how much pain and disappointment is caused by apparent failure. A mission preacher goes to a parish, and after labouring zealously for a time, returns home—poor man—quite cast down because a great commotion has not been created, and he cannot sum up in large totals the numbers of those that have been saved. How often are we on the verge of despair as we witness the masses flocking to places of worldly and often wicked amusements, while our congregations are so sparesely scattered. You are disappointed because your Sunday-school class does not appear to make progress, because you see no results in your district visiting. We forget that our Lord Himself has said that His kingdom cometh not with observation, that He likened its operations to leaven working within meal. We cast our bread upon the waters impatient of the result, forgetting that it shall be found after many days. We forget that although we may plant or water in God's vineyard, it is God alone who can quicken, vivify, and give the increase. We forget that God may wish us to labour in His vineyard without apparent result to try our faith and trust in Him. Sufficient that we faithfully and zealously strive to plant and to water.

But consider what poor judges we are of results. What, indeed, have we got to do with results? Is not that God's prerogative and His alone? What were the seeming results of Christ's years of suffering and labours of love? Of His very followers we are told, in His hour of greatest need, they all forsook Him and fled. We can almost fancy we hear a wiseacre of those times passing judgment upon our Lord: "A most devoted and good man no doubt, but indiscreet. He ought, considering He was so unpopular, to have kept away from Jerusalem during the tumultuous times of the Passover. As it is, His life has been a failure—no results.' But were they able to judge? Has Christ's life been a failure, have there been no results?

We are poor judges, I say, of results. Just when Elijah was in profoundest despair, thinking the triumph of idolatry to be complete, the Almighty knew of seven thousand men who had not bowed the knee to Baal; and soon the prophet was to be the instrument in God's hands of securing one of the greatest triumphs ever recorded, over idolatry and oppression. It was the Moravian missionaries, I think, who went out to Greenland and laboured for thirty years, apparently with no success whatever. It seems hard to suppose that they had not even broken up the ground for further missionary enterprise. But supposing that they had not even done that, were not so many long years of privation willingly endured for Christ, the very incense of a sweet smelling savour daily ascending up to the throne of heaven?

God's ways are not man's ways. He often works slowly and mysteriously. A thousand years in His sight are but as one day, and one day as a thousand years. We were reading last Sunday about God's deliverance of Israel by the hand of Moses out of Egyptian bondage. For about two hundred and fifteen years had they been in Egypt, and for the most part of that time suffering cruelty and oppression. Children had grown up into old men under the lash; generations groaning under intolerable burdens had passed away, and had apparently cried unto God in vain for deliverance. But in the Lord's own time, which must surely be the best, He delivers them with an outstretched hand and with a mighty arm. Noah was called by God to build an ark for the saving of himself and house against the deluge. But seed time and harvest, summer and winter, succeed each other as before; year after year

passes away, and the clouds do not gather nor the windows of heaven open. "Surely God hath forgotten," Noah might have said, and the arduous work of building the ark might have been cast aside had he been a man of weak faith. "But God is not slack concerning His promises as men count slackness." The floods came, and the ark of faith saved Noah from perishing.

What is the lesson which each of us has to learn from all this? Is it not the lesson which David wishes to teach us in this Psalm? To cultivate the spirit of hopeful resting in the Lord, of patient waiting for Him. How much pain and distress is often given to parents by the continued waywardness and recklessness of their children, by their apparent imperviousness to good example. 'Have patience,' the Psalmist would seem to say. 'Bide the Lord's time.' Children's characters are not formed in a day. Remember, ye parents, how long your heavenly Father bore with you during your long sojourn in the far country of forgetfulness and sin. How often have we seen good intentions thwarted by precipitate action? How often have sons, not hopelessly bad, been driven from home, and all parental influence lost, by the inconsiderate hasty action of fathers?

How much perplexity and pain is often caused to the child of God by the apparent triumph of evil over good, by the apparent irreconciliation of science and religion? Rest in the Lord: wait patiently for him. Remember the battle against sin is the Lord's. Can we doubt the ultimate result? The author of the Book is also the Lord of Creation. Can His words really contradict His works?

The political outlook, at the present time, seems of the blackest. Wait. To the Christian, there is no cloud, however black, without its silver lining. The Almighty never allows the wills or machinations of men or devils to clash with His divine purposes. "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther," He says to the decrees and purposes of sovereigns and empires, as well as to each individual being.

"But the heart knoweth his own bitterness; and a stranger doth not intermeddle with his joy." There may be some mourner here whose heart is laden with a secret load which no human heart may share. The Psalmist would say a comforting word to thee, sorrowing one. "Tarry thou the Lord's leisure." "Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." Thy night of weeping may last for a month, or a year, or a lifetime, but if thou art patient and faithful thy morning of joy will assuredly arise, and once more thy poor weary sorrowing heart will dance in gladsome sunshine—if not in this world, then in the bright radiance of eternal glory.

Let us all "trust in the Lord and do good." "Trust" and "do"—these are the watchwords of our Captain-king. Let us hopefully, cheerfully, trustfully do our part, whether it be as trusted leaders, or only as humble camp-followers in God's army, and one day it will be ours to herald the great victory, and this our short winter of conflict and suffering will be changed to eternal summer of triumph and glory.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Fifth Sunday in Lent.

Time goes steadily on and brings us to the close of all things, pleasant and disagreeable alike. The season which a few weeks ago looked so long and sad is now nearly ended. We have passed Mid-Lent, or Refreshment Sunday, with its kind teaching, that even in the saddest and gloomiest times our Blessed Lord is at hand to comfort and refresh those who call upon Him faithfully. We have but two Sundays left before we shall be called upon to leave behind us another season of Repentance and self-abasement, to join with the whole Church in celebrating the Resurrection of our Master. At such a time, this week's Collect is especially appropriate. It seems to remind us of the discipline of the past season; to sum up all its prayers and meditations in the petition "mercifully look upon Thy people, that by Thy great goodness they may be governed and preserved evermore, both in body and in soul." How much, how very much this prayer implies, none of us, in this life, can fully understand. There is no doubt, however, that though we may not be able to attain to the perfect comprehension of it here, we may and *ought* to know much more than we do. "To be governed" by God. What a privilege! What a help! Ought not all professing Christians, at least, to make this their aim? Should we not value such guidance? Think what a difference would be wrought in the world's history if such were to be the case! If all our *words* were governed by the Spirit of God, where then would be room for evil tales often without foundation? How could spiteful and unkind remarks be made; how could we withhold the word of sympathy which often goes so far to heal the wounded heart? Then, again, if we put all our *thoughts* under God's control, how different they would be! How soon would our words and our looks betray the Greater and Holier Master! We should be clothed with a beauty of holiness, the outward expression of brighter and better thoughts. Then these would produce a glorious harvest of good *deeds*. If once the thoughts and words are governed and sanctified by the control and guidance of God, the actions will partake of the blessing. We shall be anxious, as far as in us lies, to let our works be an undeniable evidence of our faith. "By their *fruits* ye shall know them." We must not forget that outsiders judge a religion from the words and deeds of its followers. Let us shrink from bringing a disgrace upon the faith which has been so much to us, which cost our Lord so much of suffering and pain. Shall we not offer up this prayer very earnestly, and seek to be *so* governed by God that we shall indeed "be preserved evermore both in body and soul." Thus only can we bring joy to the heart of our Saviour, and glory to the God of Heaven.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly
CURED
by simply using the
AMMONIAPHONE
FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.
21s. post free.
WILL LAST FOR YEARS.
Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New Illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials may be had FREE OF CHARGE on application to Medical Battery Co. Ltd.
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 6, 1889.

THE DIRECTION OF VITAL ENERGY.

THERE is a suggestive article in the February number of the *Gentleman's Magazine* on "Force and its Distribution in man," which is well worthy of the attention of clergymen, though the author, Mr. F. E. Young, puts upon his theory more strain than we think it will bear. Starting with the proposition that "all force (covering what is termed vital force, vital energy, and nervous force) contained in the universe is one in Nature," he argues that the varieties of its manifestation are due to the varieties of material organisation through which the force has to reveal its existence. The powers of a tree, the force permeating animal life, and the energy at work in man's brain are, he says, one and the same in essence. Develop the dog and he will approach the man, but he does not add, as seems necessary for his argument, develop the tree and it will approach the dog. The writer then goes on to explain that each human being has a maximum quantity of force which he cannot increase, but which he is able to distribute; in other words, he applies to the constitution of man himself the principle of the conservation of energy, as stated by Clerk Maxwell: "The total energy of any body or system of bodies is a quantity which can neither be increased or diminished by any mutual action of those bodies, though it may be transformed into any one of the forms of which energy is susceptible."

We are daily receiving fresh illustrations of the truth of this principle, especially in connection with electrical science; if we demand light, we know that an equivalent amount of heat or some other form of energy must disappear. "So," says Mr. Young, "is it in the microcosm, man"; and then he illustrates it by pointing out that athletes are generally deficient in intellectual power, on which text we should like to hear a sermon from Dr. F. J. Furnivall. He asks why are hard readers and great thinkers weakly dyspeptics: To which we reply by another question: Are they? With a fairly wide acquaintance with such persons, we should be disposed to say, No. Even were it otherwise, the cause of the dyspepsia would probably not be found in the overworked mind so much as in the sedentary habits and late hours too commonly associated with literary tastes. The great thinkers, like Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Browning, who take care of their physical health, do not suffer from their hard reading to any great extent. Highly intellectual men, our author thinks, are often deficient in the emotions, because they develop their mental nature by depriving their emotional nature of its due supply of nervous force. There is, doubtless, some truth in this, but there are many exceptions to the rule. This theory explains, also, why a brisk walk is so effectual in diminishing the emotion of grief; the force is diverted from the emotional region to the muscles. It explains, too, why the soldier in the heat of battle is unconscious of his wounds, and the study of the theory in its various ramifications will suggest to the thoughtful physician and clergyman many modes by which strain upon one side of a man's nature may be relieved by partial transference to another. The theory must not be pushed too far, but in moderation it cannot but be helpful. The latter portion of Mr. Young's article is most original and instructive. It is that in which he deals with the practical lessons which may be drawn in education and morals from an acquaintance with this theory of force. First, he says, improve the physical conformation, for to the organ that hath shall be given; secondly, see to the inherited tendencies that the set or drift of the force may be in the direction of the higher regions of the man; and lastly, let the surroundings of life as far as possible direct the force rightly and wisely; the force impelled, perhaps laboriously at first, will travel easily and pleasantly, till at last it acts automatically—education really meaning the diversion of force from channels to be suppressed, and starting it along new and selected ones which the best minds have excavated for us. All this is admirable, and pregnant with suggestion for the development of the race. We need not enlarge upon the duties and obligations thus imposed upon every generation, in relation to their successors, viz.: that they should regard their faculties and their whole nature as a sacred trust, to be transmitted in an enhanced and nobler condition and quality, as a physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual outfit, to their posterity.

MR. Percy Gott Crosse, son of the Archdeacon of Furness, who has been acting as secretary of the London Diocesan Council for the Welfare of Young Men, has been appointed secretary of the Church House.

A CLERGYMAN'S SECULAR READING.

By the Rev. E. A. WESLEY, M.A.

A Paper Read on the occasion of the Inaugural Meeting of the Denmark Hill Society, at Heatherlea, Denmark Hill.

"I am of a constitution so general that it consorts and sympathises with all things. I have no antipathy, or rather idiosyncrasy in anything. Those national repugnances do not touch me, nor do I behold with prejudice the French, Italian, Spaniard or Dutch."—*Religio Medici.*

Elia, who quotes this passage, in a charming essay on "Imperfect Sympathies," is very candid about his own shortcomings; he says he had been trying all his life to like Scotchmen, and had been obliged to desist from the experiment in despair; nor were Scotchmen the only objects of his aversion. But for books, at least those he could denominate real books, his sympathies were wide, from which category of *Biblia a Biblia* he excluded "Court directories, pocket books, draught boards bound up and lettered on the back, scientific treatises, almanacks, statutes at large, the works of Hume, Gibbon, Robertson, Beattie, Soam Jenyns, and generally all those volumes which 'no gentleman's library should be without,' the histories of Flavius Josephus (that learned Jew), and Paley's "Moral Philosophy." With these exceptions, he says, "I can read almost anything. I bless my stars for a taste so catholic, so unexcluding." Whatever may be thought of these whimsical exceptions, it is undoubtedly the catholicity of Elia that has helped to make him the bosom friend, totem or fetish of almost every cultivated man. We reach our fellow creatures usually in proportion to our sympathy with them, our power, that is, of thinking in their way, and feeling the same emotions as they experience. To some this spirit of good-fellowship comes as a gift from heaven, but the majority have to acquire it by study and practice. A clergyman who does not enter upon his career like cousin George in Alton Locke, because "it is the only profession yet discovered that can turn a snob into a gentleman," nor to fill a fat living of which some sorry seat-warmer has precarious tenure, often possesses at his start in life sympathies that would, unwarped by bigotry, render him a citizen of the world. As years roll on he not unfrequently narrows them down to the limits of his parish, then confines them to a few families, insensibly passing shade by shade, towards the evening of life into the clerical fossil, out of harmony with all men, a pulpit mummy whose experiences are of the dead and forgotten past. If he have chanced to ally himself in matrimony to a district visitor it may happen that his intellect slowly dribbles away under a surfeit of parish; the table talk being of blanket clubs, and provident societies, and measeles, the last words falling upon his ears at night, being the sleepy interrogation of his spouse about some petty detail of this eternal parish. Thus slowly narrow his sympathies from the world to the village, from the village to the parochial charities. These defects do not belong to the clergyman's vocation, whose calling is the highest and worthiest. He is or should be an Elihu,—a daysman. His mind should turn towards God instinctively, like the sunflower to the sun, to learn His will and word. His prayers and holier thoughts, his pious reading and theological study, should render him familiar with the things of God, such a one is the man of the Spirit, the man of ideas, the transcendentalist, who can see beyond the temporal into the eternal. Like his Master, he assumes as it were a mediatorial capacity. He is the human instrument chosen by the Almighty to "justify the ways of God to man"; he is the teacher of men, the sharer of their sorrows and joys; he enters into their soul-searching experiences, and their undying hopes; and when he passes away he has earned the commendation of the Chaucer's godly parson of the town:

> The lore of Christ and His Apostles twelve
> He taught, but first he followed it himselve.

These are aspects of the clerical life with which this paper is not concerned, though without them, such is their vast importance, that life is and must be a failure. On the other hand, devoid of sympathetic intercourse with his flock, a receptive intelligence that employs instinctively eye and ear to gain fresh illustrations and suggestions from the most trivial surrounding circumstances, and diligent study of men's thoughts past and present as they are to be found in literature, the man of God cannot be regarded as thoroughly furnished for all good works. If he be not *the* teacher of his people, many other instructors are abroad to take his place. The world about him does not sleep. He lives in days of free libraries and popular education, and if he regard his university learning as a Fortunatus' purse out of which he can draw unfailing supplies for every demand, he will soon discover himself on the verge of mental bankruptcy. When a Coventry chimneysweep takes out from the free library all the volumes of Grote's History of Greece one by one, and reads them all, he must awake to there being a child amongst us, taking notes, whether they get into print or not. He cannot feed flocks that embrace such members with an empty spoon. However hard pressed with the intolerable burden of too much to do, he must keep abreast with such times as these. The clerical prestige which formerly attached to his honourable and aristocratic profession has gone like a dream. Men care less for the stamp on the guinea now than they did, but they value true worth more, and are better judges of it. Hardheaded working men will seek out the clergyman who has the reputation of being a reader with curious persistency. Sometimes they will ask his opinion upon odd-looking dog-eared volumes, picked out of the cheap box at the bookstall, and watch his face as he turns over the leaves with

comical seriousness; or will seek his advice as to the course of reading calculated to assist them forward in the struggle of life. If he be able to point the way unhesitatingly like an experienced guide, they will respect his opinions, and accept his leading in preference to that of the showy and pretentious social demagogues, trades-union sharks, and political mountebanks who trade upon their credulity.

More important still is the power which a wide acquaintance with general literature places in the command of the clergyman of rendering hard matters plain to persons of small intelligence. The well-read man, whose books have been inwardly digested, can in a moment select the aptest of illustrations, and brighten his discourse with the most lively imagery. Having a good balance at his mental bank, he is not easily taken aback, seldom at a loss, and in conversation always intelligent. He can ask sensible questions, and increase his store of information as he goes his daily round. Mere book reading will not of course bestow upon him all these happy qualities, but well directed, it will place them within his reach, enlarge his sympathies, widen his horizon, and bring him into intellectual contact with his people. His learning will be less conspicuous in proportion to its more perfect assimilation. Unlike the half-educated speaker, he will not drag in a quotation by the ear, nor if he happen on a learned trifle be as eager to show it off as a child its last new toy. Nor will he imitate those light-hearted clerical triflers who grow flowery and bombastic in proportion to their own empty-headedness, or content himself with weaving text to text, like the children's daisy chain, as pretty and as perishable.

In all his work he will be sincere and thorough, never meddling with quotations he has not verified, but taken second hand from "Southgate's Many Thoughts," or some other popular source. He will be wary of employing a cyclopædia of anecdotes, preferring a bald discourse to one tricked out with meretricious finery. It is a disgrace for a clergyman to make an appearance of wide reading in his sermons, and to acknowledge in private to crass ignorance of the writers whose thoughts he has been parading. A man of that sort is a fraud, a smuggler sailing under false colours, unworthy of an honest man's respect. If we must put a dummy or two in our windows sometimes, let us at least have good wares inside.

Secular reading furnishes the speaker with direct and simple methods; enables him to talk a language the people can understand, enables him to lay aside pulpit phraseology, and musty pulpit cushion anecdotes that nobody believes and everybody has heard before. It makes a man of him, able to grapple with men's problems in a manly way, and to present old truths with vivid freshness. It emancipates him from pulpit prejudices. It enables him to venture on topics pertinent to the need of the people without regard to a nursery governess's code of proprieties, which would rule out half the topics of the day. It brings him back in spirit to the breezy dawn of the Reformation, when Latimer thought it no shame to preach about a pack of cards, or a plough lying in the field. It opens the gate of truth to him, and makes him free of the whole estate, for,

> He is the freeman whom the truth makes free
> And all are slaves besides.

Such is the enfranchisement of those who enter upon the liberties of this enchanted land.

(*To be continued.*)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

HOOKER ON THE PRESENCE.

SIR,—I think there is no authority more relied on by all sides than Hooker. If you will allow me I will say a few words on this subject.

1. He says, "The real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament." He sanctions then the use of the term "Real Presence" in a certain sense. In like manner the Report of the Irish Revision Committee of 1871 sanctions the use of the term "Objective Presence," p. 91.

2. Of course the only real presence that can be in the "very heart and soul" of the receiver must be not a material substance, but the graces which our Lord's Body can confer, and which St. Paul says the bread is the κοινωνία of. Thus even Newman says that "Our Lord is *in loco* in Heaven; not, in the same sense, in the Sacrament."

3. Now let the illustration of the sun help us. It is *in loco* in the sky, not in the same sense in my room or garden. Those who flee from the gross substantial presence of Romanists and Crypto-Romanists think that they see a material presence in the language of the Catechism and the Communion service.

4. Let us apply to this language the simile of the sun, and try if we cannot defend that language thereby. To the question, "What is the inward part, or thing signified?" the answer is, "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Now, as the Body and Blood, according to Hooker, are only to be sought in our heart and soul, they can here mean only grace from Heaven. Therefore we may use this language, as we say of the sun, that its heat, light, and attractive power are verily and indeed received by us when it pours them upon us. The next answer, which stumbles many, is to the query, "What are the benefits, etc." Answer, "The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as, etc." In the same manner we say of the effects of the sun, that we are warmed, enlightened, etc. by its body, though locally in the sky. In the Communion service we pray that we may so eat, etc., that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood. In the same manner might not an invalid, removed for health to a warmer climate, pray that the

more genial influence of the sun might resuscitate his weakened powers of life? I use the comparison with all reverence, and with a consciousness that I am likening heavenly things to earthly. But it is quite necessary to talk common sense, if we talk at all on such subjects. Newman, in Tract No. 90, speaks well of the sun's power from a distance, and compares it, as I do, to the effects from our Lord's Body in Heaven. But, afterwards, he talks nonsense about our Lord's natural Body, as the Prayer Book calls it, though he terms it "the substance," and says it does "not require or imply the occupation of space." Then he goes on to get rid of distance from Heaven to the altar, and finally of motion. (See "Via Media," p. 220: Pickering & Co., 1877.) But all this is mere words without definite ideas attached. To fight with such is only beating the air, or attacking an unsubstantial cloud.

5. So far I have followed Hooker, but I think he errs from the Catechism, and even from the definition of a Sacrament. If the presence is not to be sought, as coming with the bread, the bread is no means; and, further, without the bread as a means, the Eucharist, consisting of only one part, the grace, is really no sacrament at all, if a sacrament must have two parts. I know it may be said that the grace coming down on us when we receive, these are the two parts. That may be so, but the bread, not conveying the grace, does not suit the words "a means whereby we receive the same." The receiving may be the means, but the bread is not. The words of administration "the Body preserve," used in conveying the bread, is opposed to Hooker, as are also the words of the 25th Article, "the Body is given, taken, and eaten." If the words of administration do not mean what I say, why did the Puritans of Edward II.'s book omit them?

6. Some object to the illustration of the sun. They say that the sun's light, heat, attraction, etc., are solid substances, and that therefore the analogous outflow from our Lord's Body is material also. To this I reply that I don't believe that the heat, light, etc., are solid substances, as in that case the substances of the sun's body would be wasting away. But that, if they are, they cease to be analogous to the graces from Christ's Body, which are not substantial.

7. If we could agree that the presence is one of grace only, the Lincoln prosecution might cease. Who cares about the mitre, the incense, and the crossings, except as to their being unauthorised? All turns upon the doctrine of "actual contact" between our Lord's material Body and ours, and the extension of the Incarnation, as they say. If men will only believe the 4th Article, which they subscribe, they will see that His Body is locally in Heaven alone, and can be only spiritually, that is, by effects elsewhere. If adoration is offered only to His Deity, everywhere present, no one objects to it. Let this be stated, though bowing to the altar, with the consecrated elements upon it, is very suspicious.

8. It may be said that a presence is quite as effectual, though it accompanies not the bread. No doubt of it. Virtue went out of His Body when on earth. It was only in the case of the woman that it came from her touching His garment in faith. An outward means of conveyance is granted with the Eucharist not as a necessary medium, but merely as a pledge to assure us that the grace accompanies it. If a sacrament must have two parts, what has only one is no sacrament at all, though like prayer, reading, and sermons, it may be very beneficial. Where God has tied a grace to a means, though He may act without the means, we are not needlessly to set it aside. This is all that the 4th Rubric in communion for the sick means, or possibly can mean.

9. There are two terms on which the whole controversy turns. These are "a spiritual body" and "spiritually present." A spiritual body, as opposed to a natural body, only means immortal and free from infirmity. It does not imply, as anything new, ability to effect at a distance, for that our Lord's Body had when a natural body. So much for a spiritual body. "Spiritually present" is opposed to corporally present. It means present by effects, as opposed to present locally, and by contact. Sound notions on the presence depend on rightly taking these two expressions.

C.C., V.-G.

CHURCH LAW DEPENDENT ON STATE LAW.

SIR,—Canon Crosthwaite, in the PULPIT of the 16th inst. writes:—"The Irish Church is disestablished; but if any clergyman were to defy our General Synod, and try to hold (his) benefice, the appeal would be to the law courts." This is quite true, but it may mislead. Those clergymen of the Church of Ireland who held their appointment before disestablishment have, to some extent, a privileged position; but those appointed under the new order are absolutely bound by the legislation of the Church, through its General Synod, as interpreted by the Courts of the Church itself. If any such clergyman were to violate the laws made by the General Synod, the remedy would be through a Church Court; and if he were to defy the Court, and the authority of the State had to be called on to dispossess him of the position he had abused, the State would act, not as judge, but only as policeman.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 22nd March, 1889.

IS ALL OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY A MYTH OR A FAIRY TALE?

SIR,—We are driven to ask this question. You have now five writers arguing in favour of this theory. These call themselves by various names, whether real or not. They are opposed to one another, and we might leave them to cut one another's arguments to pieces, as Moab and Ammon did Edom, 2 Chron. xx. 23. But we will not depend on that.

1. They seem to say that parables are as useful as histories. Well, then, let us say that the accounts of our Lord's entombment and resurrection are, what is delicately called, an apologue, and that it may be very useful as shadowing forth that our new nature, having been buried in sin, may now rise again. Will they carry their theory so far? Why not? May not what sounds like history be a mere parable or myth? I thought they said so.

2. May New Testament language decide which is history and which not? We are told not; that we are not at all to be led by what our Lord or Apostles say.

3. Is it conceivable that history and fairy tales would, by our Lord, be mixed up together, so that it

requires "Presbyter" and Co. to distinguish where the line is to be drawn? If all about Jonah is a myth, is the repentance, etc., of Nineveh a myth also? Is all about Solomon and the Queen of Sheba a myth also? Because the rock that followed may be the water merely; because we do not understand exactly about the Devil and Moses's body, or the law being given by angels, or Job, does this justify us in making fairy tales of what we *do* understand, and which comes to us as much in the form of actual history as anything possibly can do?

4. This German rationalistic treatment of the Word of God makes utterly without authority every narrative in either Testament. We are left to deduce what moral lesson we may from all these histories as if they were parables. In fact, we have taken from God the power of relating facts to us by making it an axiom that when He pretends to so, He is merely teaching abstract truths under the form of narratives.

5. Unless every book in both Testaments is to be reduced to the level of fairy tales, like Esther, Ruth, Job, there must be a line drawn, that we may know where God speaks literally and where by parables. Things cannot rest as they are. Every honest man should speak out, and say, I am for history, when God gives it that character; I am for parables only where God evidently meant to speak thus, as in our Lord's case of the Prodigal Son and Dives and Lazarus. All at present is thrown into confusion, in which it cannot possibly be left to remain.

6. Those who seem to make all a fairy tale should tell us where, if anywhere, they have drawn, or can draw, the line. The *onus* lies on them, unless they will openly pose as infidel writers, shaking all faith, and confirming none.

7. "Presbyter" ends with practical reflections on the story as a parable. But they all follow just as well when it is taken as a history.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Askwith, Rev. W. H., Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene's, Taunton; Rural Dean of Taunton.

Bathe, Rev. Anthony, Vicar of Paull and Thorngumbald, Hull.

Bowlan, Rev. W., LL.D., Chaplain of Newcastle Gaol; Chaplain of Her Majesty's Prison, Armley.

Bruce-Austin, Rev. P. G., Chaplain in the Bengal Presidency.

Dalton, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Rector of Seagrave, Leicestershire.

Gamson, Rev. Charles Robert, M.A., Licensed Preacher in Diocese of Southwell.

Green, Rev. David, M.A., Curate of All Saints', Battersea Park

Green, Rev. S. F., late Vicar of St. John's, Miles Platting; Rector of Charlton, Dover.

Harris, Rev. W. H., Curate of Great Yarmouth; Assistant Secretary of the East London Church Fund.

Hotham, Rev. F. W., Rector of Cricket Malherbie; Chaplain of the Chard Union Workhouse.

Jukes, Rev. Richard Starr, Rector of Milton-next-Gravesend.

Knowles, Rev. E. H., M.A., of St. Bees'; Rural Dean of Whitehaven.

Leakey, Rev. J. A., Rector of St. Gerran's, Cornwall; Vicar of Weston, near Bath.

Leigh, Rev. N. E., Vicar of Kirkstall, Yorkshire.

Low, Rev. Charles, M.A., Curate of Mitcham, Surrey.

Milligan, Rev. W. T., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Margaret's District, Nottingham; Vicar of St. Luke's, Wolverhampton.

Mosse, Rev. Charles Wynn, Th. A. K.C.L., Rector of Huish, Devonshire.

Owen, Rev. Arthur Welsh, M.A., Rector of Wembworthy; Rector of Eggesford, Devon.

Paley, Rev. Francis Henry, M.A., Rector of Gonalston, Notts.

Partridge, Rev. C., Vicar of Moulton St. James's, near Spalding.

Pascoe, Rev. Samuel, Curate of St. Colomb Minor; Vicar of St. Issey, Cornwall.

Pennington, Rev. John J. H. S., Rector of Tunstall, near Sittingbourne, Kent; Rector of St. Clement Danes, Strand.

Rendell, Rev. A. M., Rector of Coston, Leicestershire; Vicar of St. Margaret's, Leicester.

Robinson, Rev. Alexander Percival, Vicar of St. Stephen's, Southwark.

Savage, Rev. H. E., M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, West Hartlepool; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham.

Sutton, Rev. Meyrick J., Vicar of St. Keverne; Vicar of Kirton-in-Lindsey, Lincolnshire.

Smart, Rev. Robert William John, M.A., Rector of Parkham, Devon.

Stokoe, Rev. Thomas Henry, D.D., Preacher to the Honourable Society of Gray's-inn and Head Master of King's College School; Rector of Lutterworth, Leicestershire.

Thomson, Rev. Francis Drake, M.A., Vicar of Barrow-upon-Soar, Leicestershire.

Thornley, Rev. J. J., Vicar of St. John's, Workington; Honorary Canon of Carlisle Cathedral.

Tomlinson, Rev. Edward Murray, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Minories; Vicar of East Meon, Hants.

Turner, Rev. John Ellis, M.A., Vicar of Riseley, Bedfordshire.

Vaughan, Rev. Wycliffe, Curate-in-Charge of Esholt, near Shipley; Vicar of St. George's, Chorley.

Walters, Rev. W. H., Curate of St. Paul's, Beckenham; Rector of Rudbaxton, near Haverfordwest.

Ward, Rev. Charles Bruce, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Glossop; Surrogate.

Wedge, Rev. William, B.A., Curate; Vicar of Houghton Regis, Bedfordshire.

Wilkinson, Rev. Henry James, M.A., Rector of Stockton, Shifnal.

Wilson, Rev. Theodore Cameron, Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, Paignton, Devonshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Belchamber, Rev. George, Vicar of Threapwood, at Threapwood Vicarage, Malpas, on the 17th ult., aged 36.

Bell, Rev. J. D., at Totteridge Park, on the 25th ult., aged 59.

Cockin, Rev. William, M.A., Hon. Canon of Durham, and late Rector of Bishopwearmouth, at 3, Bootham Terrace, York, on the 22nd ult.

Frith, Rev. Marischal Keith Smith, M.A. (Rural Dean), Vicar of Allestre, at the Vicarage, Allestre, on the 29th ult., aged 69.

Gresson, Rev. John George, M.A., of West Mansion, Heene, Worthing, youngest son of the late George Leslie Gresson, of Ardnorcher, King's County, Ireland, on the 1st inst., aged 57.

Micklethwait, Rev. Sotherton Nathaniel, M.A., for nearly forty years Vicar of Hickling, Norfolk, on the 25th ult., aged 65.

Schön, Rev. James Frederick, D.D., F.R.G.S., formerly C.M.S. Missionary in West Africa, and subsequently Chaplain at Melville Hospital, Chatham, at Palm Cottage, New Brompton, on the 30th ult., aged 85.

Sowerby, Rev. Edwin Philip Nixon, B.A., Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, at York, on the 25th ult., aged 33.

The Church of England Pulpit.

NEUTRALITY IN MATTERS OF RELIGION.

By Rev. Canon OVENDEN, B.D.

Sermon Preached in the Parish Church, Enniskillen, on Sunday, February 10th, 1889.

"He that is not wth Me is against Me, and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth abroad."—St. Matt. xii. 30.

THESE words contain the declaration by our Blessed Lord of a condition of membership in the Christian religion which men find it very hard to act upon. It was this condition which caused, we may say, chiefly, the persecutions which were directed against the early Christians. Pagan Rome was most tolerant towards the various forms of religion adopted by the many and various nations which owned her sway. She had her Pantheon, which was a temple for all gods, where every deity had its allotted place on terms of equality with all the rest. But this was a position of tolerated equality, which the early Christians would never accept for their divine Master. It was their refusal which roused against them the indignation of the Roman rulers who were incensed at what they called the unbearable conceit and stubborn pride of the Christians. They claimed all for Christ He was the one meditator between God and man, the true Messiah, the Lord who should judge the quick and the dead. The heathen idols they said were no gods. Now somewhat the same feeling of indignation exists in the present day among worldly men towards those who are really earnest Christians. The law of society is that men respect religion to a certain extent, if only religious people would keep it in its proper place. They would even like to have a respectable moderate amount of it in their own lives, but this talk about deciding for Christ, being on the Lord's side, etc., such phrases only make religion an intolerable nuisance. These decided Christians are really persons not fit for the company of men of sense, and so they feel an instinctive aversion to them. Are you not aware, brethren, of the existence of this feeling amongst many in our day. I believe it exists, and yet if words mean anything, is not the position of the earnest Christian of early ages, and the decided Christian of modern times not only justified, but absolutely necessitated by the words of our Lord. Hear them again, "He that is not with Me is against Me; and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth abroad." Let us consider this morning the logical necessity for the principle contained in these words. We admit that there are certain circumstances in which a man may adopt a strictly neutral position, for instance, in the discussion of theories. In every discussion of theory there is the disputant who maintains his theory and the critic who states his objections. In these discussions it is obvious the critic has a great advantage. He need not maintain any theory or give any explanation of phenomena—all he has to do is to point out some defect in his opponent's argument. For instance, suppose some one to maintain a theory on the laws which regulate the weather, and as a result of his investigation he forecasts that a certain month will be fine, the critic has only to point out that the month in question was wet above the average and his victory is complete; he is not bound to propound any other theory, he is not bound to answer the question which might be asked by the first man, "Well then, if my theory be incorrect, what do you propose?" The critic answers, "I do not know, I do not care, I propose no theory, but I have proved that you are decidedly wrong." Now, the critic's position as regards the sort of summer we are to have this year may be one of absolute neutrality, or what we might call suspension of judgment, but the moment the question passes from theory to practice his position becomes untenable. Suppose the person with whom he argues is a farmer, the farmer is forced to say, "You may be neutral, but I cannot be; I must decide what crops I shall put in my fields. This field is good for tillage should the season be dry, but if it be wet I had better leave it for grazing." The farmer must come to a decision. If he break up his field he acts as if he had certain proof that the season would be favourable for tillage; if he leaves it unbroken he acts as if he had a demonstration that the summer would be wet. This illustration applies to the question of religion. We must decide what sort of life we shall lead, shall we gather with Christ or not—no middle course is logically possible for us, and this is exactly the position which the world is so unwilling to accept. But it is logically necessary, because true religion is a practical life and not a theory. Indeed it is very important to observe this, because all turns upon the question whether religion be a life of practice, or whether it be a speculative theory. I freely admit that there are theories and many speculative questions included in religion. With regard to these, a true Christian's mind may remain in suspension all his life. For instance, the discussion of prophecies concerning the Jews and their future; speculations concerning the state of the departed; theories about angels and seraphims. If religion consisted of the discussion of these and such like theories the principle of our text would not apply, because the practical effect upon our

lives should be the same, no matter what theory we held. But there was no invitation to a speculative argument in the words of Christ to His disciples, "Follow thou Me." His work was not to propound theories, but to enlist followers. In answering or refusing to answer that call there is absolutely no room for neutrality. Our life, whether we like it or not, must be either a following of Christ, or a not following of Him. If you press this fact home to your conscience it may lead you to startling conclusions. Ask yourself, "Can I honestly say I am following Christ, I am consciously gathering with Him?" For instance, weigh with yourself the amount of your harvest of spiritual work gathered in last week. Now, I want you to think for a moment, and just answer that question to yourself, "Did you gather in with Christ?" Well, what is your answer? Is it a blank? If so, what is the inference?—"He that gathered not with me scattereth abroad." Oh, but you say, "That is going too far. I am not an active Christian, I admit, but I am not an enemy of the Gospel." Then ask yourself, Why not? Let me illustrate. A contested election may illustrate the battle for the cause of Christ in the world against the powers of evil. In an election you must take your part. If you vote you are on one side or the other. If you abstain from voting you are still influencing the election. Suppose it result in a tie or a majority of one, then the whole election lay practically in the hands of him who held back his one vote. Need we be surprised that the same law acts in religion as in secular matters. If you saw two men fighting, and you stood by neutral until one was killed, would you not be morally responsible for a share in the murder which you might have prevented.

Now, let us consider our position if we have to confess that we thought that we did no harm by our neutrality towards the cause of Christ and His Church. I assume that you consider there is some evidence of the truth of Christ's claims, not evidence convincing to you, but at least some. What is the position of the neutral man—that is, the inactive Christian? Suppose it turn out that the infidel was right, then personally, if you preferred the worldly life, and followed it, no penalty ensues, supposing that death is the absolute end of existence. But suppose, as we believe, that it is morally certain that the infidel is in the wrong, that as a fact "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad," then, without doubt, there lies before you an eternity of unspeakable calamity. You are in the position of a man who neglects to insure his premises. He argues there are chances that my house may never catch fire — there are also remote chances that it may. If no fire take place he escapes, but if in spite of the remoteness of the chance a fire does break out, his loss is irreparable. Hence, even on the doctrines of *remote* chance, every man of common prudence insures his house. Here, again, just because it is a practical matter, there is no possibility of neutrality between insuring and not insuring. The man who insures is safe; the man who does nothing is in precisely the same position as some one who actively resisted the policy of insuring. If, therefore, you believe that there is any evidence of the existence of the soul after the death of the body, you ought to be, in common prudence, an earnest Christian. How much more if you be ready to admit that the evidence of the truth of religion is such that it amounts to a moral certainty? No wonder that our Lord calls the rich man who made no provision for Eternity a fool. "Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee." I have spoken of the motive of prudence. Let me appeal to a higher motive. There is nothing from which an honourable man shrinks more than the imputation of meanness, and surely ingratitude for benefits received is the height of meanness. Assuming nothing beyond an evidence of probability, or even possibility, for the truth of the Gospel, what is our position supposing it *possible* (and all grant the argument so far) that when we close our eyes in death we are to open them on the revelation of the living Christ. If He say to us, "You heard the story of my agony endured for you. I did this for thee, what hast thou done for Me?" How will the neutral man feel then? If he be a man of honour, I can conceive his first thought to be, "Lord send me to hell; knowing how base I have been, I cannot endure to receive as a gift Thy salvation." Oh, sleepy, inactive Christian, do you wish to see yourself in such a position? To look back on all that we might have done, and to know that our opportunity is gone for ever. God save us from that unendurable self-reproach which in the very nature of the case must last for ever. Lastly, let us consider our position if we be true workers for Christ. If we can honestly say, "Lord I have heard Thy call to go work in Thy Vineyard, and I have been working day by day together with Thee. I have espoused Thy cause as my own, and I will strive to be loyal to Thee and to labour for Thee as long as life lasts." Let us work out the problem on the double supposition, which I have assumed for the sake of argument all along. What is the position of the Christian worker? Suppose that somehow or other there has been a grand mistake about the Gospel, and that Christ and all Christians end their existence with the death of the body in common with all other organisms of the lower creation. In such a case, however improbable, what is the review of life? I have faced the possibility, and this is my conclusion—The light of Christ's life of holiness and self-sacrifice is the noblest, clearest light that the world has ever seen. If our existence is to be

limited to a few short years, it is still better to live nobly than to live meanly. It is better to feel that those who come after us shall be better, because of the work and example which we leave behind us. The only hope for regenerating the world and raising mankind to true happiness lies in enlisting men under the banner of Christ as His followers. If all men followed Christ and His example, this world would be a finite heaven. Therefore, as a lover of the human race, I am bound to be a Christian, and if a Christian at all, surely a whole-hearted, active, enthusiastic Christian and not a neutral one. If any man love the principles of Christ's life he can further those principles best by being a true follower of Christ. But supposing we turn from the dark gropings of our unaided reason and remembering the historical facts on which our religion is founded, exclaim with St. Paul, "But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept." This being so, what then? Yes, my friends, what then? The prospect is almost too bright, too dazzling for our mortal sight. If when our eyes darken in death there shall dawn upon us the ever increasing radiant light of everlasting day, then what will it be to have spent our lives gathering for Christ? If we can say, "What I hoped was true is better than true, here is the messenger sent to bring my trembling soul into the presence of Him whom I have loved and served. Jesus is mine, and I am His for ever. The trial is past, the doubts are gone, pain is no more, and the seeds which I sowed in that past life are germinating now to grow on earth, and lead men even upward, onward, and heavenward. Oh the joy that I obeyed, even though the evidences were doubtful. Oh, the blessing that though I did not see yet I believed. I gathered with Christ, and now comes the harvest. Who are these who advance to meet me? Ah, those whom in doubt and fear I led to believe in Jesus and to trust in His salvation, now my companions for eternity." Then at last to crown all shall be heard the longed for words, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." Surely, to him who "gathers" to live is Christ, and to die is gain.

AN interesting meeting was held on Tuesday last, in Albion Place, London Wall, in connection with the Barbican Mission to the Jews. After a substantial tea, to which about 150 poor Jews from the East End, chiefly German and Polish, sat down, the 40th of Israel was read in three languages, and the meeting was addressed by the Rev. Gordon Calthorp (President), Rev. J. H. Scott (Vicar of Spitalfields), Rev. J. B. B. Burroclough, and Rev. E. A. Wesley (Hon. Sec.) in English, and Mr. Goldenberg and Mr. Lipschytz (Superintendent of the Mission) in German. The speeches were listened to with great attention and interest, those who understood English joining heartily in the Christian hymns which were sung in the course of the evening. Meetings for the Jews are held every Saturday in Albion Hall from 3 to 5 p.m.

CLERICALISM.

By the Rev. JULIUS LLOYD, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Manchester, Vicar of Leesfield, and Hon. Canon.

Sermon Preached at the Lent Ordination in Manchester Cathedral.

"We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake."—1 Thess. v. 12, 13.

ON these occasions the subject of the sermon is prescribed by the Rubric, which directs, "There shall be a sermon or exhortation, declaring the Duty and Office of such as come to be admitted Priests (or Deacons); how necessary their Order is in the Church of Christ; and also how the people ought to esteem them in their Office." St. Paul's words, which I have read for a text, bear especially on the last point, "how the people ought to esteem them in their office." His first letter to the Thessalonians has a peculiar interest, as probably the earliest Christian writing which we possess: and in it he refers to the Christian ministry under three distinct forms: labouring, presiding, and admonishing. A connection may obviously be traced between these three forms of service, and the three several Orders of the ministry, which have existed ever since the time of the Apostles. Our Church has been careful to retain this threefold ministry, and to preserve the succession of ministers by laying on of hands. But while we justly value our spiritual pedigree, the most effective claim of the clergy to esteem is still, as in St. Paul's day, "for their work's sake." The work, if done with honesty and diligence, carries in its nature a sufficient title to esteem and affection. Pastoral visitation, which is more especially the Deacon's office; spiritual instruction, which is more especially the duty of the Presbyter or Priest; and government, which is the Bishop's office, are indispensable parts of the ministry of God's Word and Sacraments. Whether separately or in combination, the work bears intimately on the welfare of every human soul.

We clergy have no cause, as a body, to complain of the measure of esteem which we receive from the laity. On the whole, I think we get as much as we deserve. If here and there we meet with less than justice, we are more often treated with an indulgent generosity, which is one of the dangers of a young clergyman. With his stole he puts on the title "Reverend," and is received untried with all the confidence which can be earned by a layman of the most approved character. He is trusted to administer, it may be, considerable sums of money. He is made a welcome guest in family circles, where nothing is known of him except his clerical office. He is apt to be regarded by the more confiding part of his flock as if the ideal of holiness,

which he sets before them in his sermons, and which he is really striving to attain, were attained already. And then, perhaps, if they discover in him the common infirmities of human nature, they resent as a fault in him the error of their own rash estimate, and think he has deceived them, whereas they have simply deceived themselves.

In various ways the clergy are tried by a standard of comparison, which wrongs them while it flatters them. "How is it," men inquire, "that we hear so few good sermons?" The question is not a wise one. Goodness is comparative; and in the present day, when the best sermons are to be found in popular magazines, the compositions of ordinary men must needs appear weak and dull. At the Bar or in Parliament, our attention is fixed on a few prominent speakers. In the Church, twenty thousand men are called to preach Sunday by Sunday. Can it be wondered at, if a hearer, who during the week may have listened to the perfect elocution of a great orator or tragedian, finds the delivery of the parish priest on Sunday far below the mark? The critical faculty in our day is developed to an extreme, even among those who can do nothing else but criticise. It is but natural that a highly cultured layman misses in the clergy that breadth of view and fulness of information which he finds in his favourite periodical, not to mention more elaborate works. The fact, that such comparisons are made at all shows that an exaggerated standard of worth for the clergy survives in minds which might be expected to take their true measure.

Besides, the clergy lead a life which is open to examination in every part. Intellectual qualities have a secondary place in the estimate which is formed of them. In other vocations, a man's fitness for work of a particular kind is the only thing much considered. He may be a judge, a general, or an admiral, without the circumstances of his private life coming into question. But a clergyman lives as in a glass house. His example is part of his ministry. Domestic faults, and even misfortunes, such as would not be noticed in the case of a layman, become scandals in the parson of a parish, and sometimes oblige him to resign his charge, for mere shame, without any fault of his own.

Thus the clerical office is apt to be magnified in popular opinion to a degree which is hardly fair to the clergy themselves, who are but men. But while the views to which I have referred are very prevalent, there is a minority to whom the clergy and their office are objects of hostility; a minority, strong in earnestness if not in numbers, for whom the word "Clericalism" sums up the principles which they most abominate. Representatives of the anti-clerical spirit are not very likely to be present here. But we are all in the habit of meeting them; and it is right that we should try to understand how far we have any ground in common with them.

So far as a prejudice against the clergy is justified by the misconduct of individuals, we can only deplore the cause. Sacerdotal pride and narrow parochial jealousies offend against the first principles of Christian life. So far as we are open to the reproach of stern censors like Milton, that

> "The hungry sheep look up, and are not fed,"

we may be thankful for the unfriendly blows which awaken us to our duty. Hostility to the clergy is not always hostility to religion. Even when it assumes a form which may literally be termed anti-Christian, it may be compared to the fanaticism of those Jewish zealots of whom St. Paul said, "They have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge."

Anti-clerical prejudice is, in some minds, the mere dislike which men feel towards those whose cares and interests are alien from their own. In other minds it has a rational source, being prompted by motives with which we must needs have sympathy, though they are misdirected with pernicious effect. Two strong passions, for liberty of action, and for liberty of thought, are the motives to which I would attribute the anti-clerical spirit of our time. Freedom, political and intellectual, is the watchword of enemies of the clergy, abroad and at home.

Is it true, that the clergy are opposed to freedom? In a popular sense, yes: in a deeper sense, no. The clergy are to the body of society what conscience is to the individual man, monitors, reminding every one of the Divine law; of his moral responsibility, of his past transgressions. Of course, a man's conscience is a restraint on the freedom of his will when he wants to do wrong; and therefore men, who are bent on crime, often get drunk deliberately to stifle their conscience. So, in the social system, the clergy are a restraint to self-willed men, by their moral influence. But there is a deeper and truer sense of freedom, according to which the only free man is one who does what is right, because he wills what is right. In this sense conscience gives freedom to the individual man, by emancipating him from the slavery of vicious desires. In the same sense the clergy, when they fulfil their proper office, give freedom to society, resisting alternately the violence of both extreme parties.

Many are the critical times at which the clergy of our English Church have risen to the height of their sacred office, as friends of civil and intellectual liberty. No man had a larger share in abolishing personal slavery in England than Archbishop Dunstan. No man did or suffered more to mitigate the cruelties of feudal jurisdiction than Archbishop Becket. No man was more prominent in obtaining the Great Charter than Archbishop Langton. No man did more to give us the Bible and Prayer-book in English than Archbishop Cranmer. No Englishman contributed more to

the bloodless revolution, which has given us two centuries of domestic peace, than Archbishop Sancroft. It is indeed rarely that the clergy have risen so high, in the person of their chief representatives. They have been the children of their age, and the spirit of their age has worked in them, along with a class spirit. Yet throughout there has not been wanting a purer and nobler spirit of love to God and man, which has been an important factor of English liberty for more than a thousand years.

We can claim for the clergy, with no less justice, that they have been good friends to genuine freedom of thought. Freedom consists, it must be remembered, not merely in throwing off old fetters, but in refusing new ones; not merely in escaping the bondage of ancient traditions, but in escaping that of modern theories. There is as much intellectual servitude in blind unbelief as in blind belief.

Free thought, as it is called, sits imprisoned within the bars of human experience, and, like the prisoner of Chillon, sees the glimmer of sunlight from outside, creeping along the wall; which reflection the poor captive soul calls "the Absolute," "the Unknowable," a "Something not ourselves." There is more true freedom in the soul of the Psalmist of Israel, who looks to the eternal God as a Father and a Friend, and says,

> "I will walk at liberty,
> For I seek thy commandments."

The clergy by their office are guardians of certain great truths, which were of old revealed by the Spirit of God. But they do not profess to have acquired an exhaustive knowledge of truth, not even of spiritual truth. Every age in turn throws new light on previous revelations. Certainly this age, if it has taught us nothing else, has interpreted with fresh power, by means of physical science, the primary attributes of God—His Unity, Infinity, Eternity.

In the active movement of modern thought, the office of the clergy is of great and increasing value, to reconcile the elements of truth, which are dispersed more and more, as knowledge becomes more and more specialised. We cannot, any of us, grasp the whole circle of science. We must be content to sit at the feet of astronomers, naturalists, antiquarians, linguists, in their several departments. On the other hand, our familiarity with the common round of daily life, with young and old, with rich and poor, with the sick and the bereaved, gives a practical turn to our minds, guards us from pedantry, and keeps fresh our sense of the importance of providing for those vital needs of the soul, which only the Gospel of Christ can satisfy.

It needs no gift of prophecy to forecast that the Church has perilous times approaching. These our brethren, who are to-day to be ordained Priests and Deacons, may live to undergo a religious crisis as severe as that which the clergy in France have experienced within our memory. Pray for them, that they may be strengthened for their work by the Holy Ghost the Comforter; that they may live "not as lords over God's heritage, but as ensamples to the flock"; that they may neither be spoiled by flattery nor disheartened by difficulty; that they may, like John the Baptist, "constantly speak the truth, boldly rebuke vice, and patiently suffer for the truth's sake:" that they may, above all, set always before their face their blessed Lord and Saviour.

A word in conclusion on the offertory which is to be given to-day to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Our Church, whatever its anxieties at home, does not relax its energies abroad. Like the Roman Republic, which sent an army to Spain with unshaken courage when Hannibal was at the gates of the city, we are sending some of the most promising of our youths to preach the Gospel of Christ in the most distant quarters of the globe: not that we are insensible to need and danger at home, but that we trust in the Captain of our salvation, and believe that our cause will prosper best by obeying His word of command.

REPENTANCE.

By the Rev. R. DIXON.

Sermon Preached at St. Michael's, Stockwell, on April 29th, 1888.

"For though I made you sorry with a letter, I do not repent, though I did repent: for I perceive the same epistle hath made you sorry, though it were but for a season. Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance; for ye were made sorry after a godly manner that ye might receive damage by us in nothing. For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death."—2 Cor. vii. 8, 9, 10.

IT is important to note that the Greek word translated "repent" in verse 8 is not the same word as that for "repentance" in verses 9 and 10, and has a different meaning. And so in the Revised Version the eighth verse is rendered thus:—"For though I made you sorry with my epistle, I do not regret it, though I did regret." 'So beneficial have been the results,' the Apostle seems to say, 'I do not now regret that I wrote thus to you, however anxious I was at the time. I was much pained by the necessity of having to give such a reproof, but the result has more than compensated for all my previous anxiety.' The word "repentance" in the two following verses, which we will notice later, has an altogether different meaning. It does not express a feeling of anxiety, such as St. Paul felt, as to the result of his Epistle, but literally "a change of mind" consequent on sorrow for wrong done.

In order to understand the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, it is necessary to bear in mind

the circumstances under which the First was written. Great irregularities had sprung up in the Church at Corinth during the absence of St. Paul, which had called forth the severest censure at the hands of the Apostle. He had been compelled to give a solemn sentence of excommunication against an incestuous member of the Church. The spirit in which the Epistle would be received, and the effect it would produce, had filled the Apostle with the gravest solicitude. It appears he had despatched Titus to Corinth to learn the result, and to return and report to him at Troas, whither the Apostle himself had arranged to go and wait for the tidings before he journeyed on to Macedonia. During his stay at Troas, awaiting the arrival of Titus, so great was the Apostle's anxiety for the welfare of the Church at Corinth, "that although a door was opened unto him of the Lord, he had no rest," he tells us. Although an opportunity for preaching the Gospel of Christ—his greatest joy on earth—was afforded him at Troas, he found no peace and no comfort. For were not his own children at Corinth—his sons and daughters begotten in the Lord—in danger of spiritual destruction and death? Those of you parents, who know what it is to wait for deferred tidings of a distant child lying dangerously ill, will appreciate the feelings of the Apostle while he waits at Troas. "Furthermore," he says, "when I came to Troas to preach Christ's Gospel, and a door was opened unto me of the Lord, I had no rest in my spirit because I found not Titus my brother; but taking my leave of them, I went from thence into Macedonia." Arrived at Macedonia, he there finds Titus. And oh! the joy! all is well! The epistle had accomplished its mission. Paul's authority as an inspired Apostle had been established, the uprisings and tumults had been quelled, the guilty person had been duly excommunicated. It was under these conditions, on receiving these satisfactory tidings from Titus, that St. Paul sits down to write his Second Epistle to the Corinthians. It is to some extent congratulatory. He expresses his gratitude that his former letter had been so well received, and had so effectually accomplished its purpose. It abounds with further advice and warnings to them, consequent on the receipt of fuller information from Titus as to the state of affairs in the Church. He tells them how deeply he had been affected by the case of the unhappy individual who had been guilty of incest. Since, however, they had obeyed his injunctions, and had inflicted discipline on the offender, he exhorts them to forgive the unhappy man, and restore him again to their fellowship, "lest," he adds, "such an one should be swallowed up of overmuch grief." He reminds them of their obligations to the poor brethren in Judæa. He recounts how, out of much affliction and anguish, and with many tears, he wrote his former Epistle; and with what absorbing, anxious, paralysing fear he waited the return of Titus; his joy on learning of their obedience and contrition. He then goes on naturally to point out—which is the object of the words of the text—the nature of real contrition, true repentance. "For when we were come into Macedonia, our flesh had no rest, but we were troubled on every side; without were fightings, within were fears, Nevertheless God, that comforteth those that are cast down, comforted us by the coming of Titus; and not by his coming only, but by the consolation wherewith he was comforted in you, when he told us your earnest desire, your mourning, your fervent mind toward me: so that I rejoiced the more. For though I made you sorry with a letter, I do not regret it, though I did regret; for I perceive that the same epistle hath made you sorry, though it were but for a season. Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance; for ye were made sorry after a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us in nothing. For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of; but the sorrow of the world worketh death. It is quite clear, then, there are two kinds of sorrow for sin—an effectual sorrow, and a useless, nay, a fatal sorrow—a sorrow unto repentance, and a sorrow unto death.

I. Let us consider for a few moments the second of the two, first: The sorrow of the world, which worketh death." The sorrow of the world—as opposed to godly sorrow—is that sorrow which has no reference to a Divine Being justly angered, no reference to sin as committed against God, that sorrow which arises only from the consequences of wrong done. It is the sorrow of that moral leper of society, who, under the cloak of friendship, enters a fair and happy home, and lays it in the dust of shame and degradation; the sorrow of such an one when his infamous conduct comes under the gaze of public opinion, and ostracises him from the society of decent people. It is the sorrow of the drunkard, when his money is all spent, and he can no longer indulge his vitiated appetite; or when his once strong frame has been corrupted and undermined. It is the sorrow of the detected and convicted felon, as he chafes and frets hopelessly in his prison cell. It is the sorrow of the degraded female, at the thought of having plunged herself and her family into shame. Such sorrow often worketh literal death by suicide. It always worketh spiritual and eternal death. For it leaves sin—as sin, as a violation of the Divine Law—unrepented of. It leaves a justly angered Almighty God unappeased. The sorrow of the world is only at the consequences, we say, of sin. Its wages is death, eternal death. For it leaves the heart-springs impure and unchanged. It leaves the man or woman still in heart a drunkard, an unclean liver, or a felon: and still among that class of whom we read in the Revelation, "the fearful and

unbelieving, and abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, who shall have their part in that lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." A terrible commentary on our text! The sorrow of the world worketh death.

II. But godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of. Godly sorrow: that is, such sorrow as hath respect unto God. Such sorrow as is produced by the consciousness of a Divine Law broken. Such sorrow as reveals sin as committed essentially against God. Such sorrow as David experienced when he exclaimed, "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in Thy sight." That is, the wrong done to his fellow-man, though great, was as nothing to the heinousness of the offence in the sight of Almighty God. Such a conception of sin as Joseph had when he exclaimed, "How can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?" Great as would have been the wrong done to his fellow-man and to himself, it was not so much this thought which kept the patriarch spotless as the hatefulness of the sin in the sight of Almighty God. Such a conception of sin strikes at the mainsprings of a man's life; it alters his attitude towards all sin. He hates sin, not only, not chiefly, because of its consequences, but because of its sinfulness. Such sorrow, the Apostle tells us, worketh repentance unto salvation. That is, worketh "a change of mind," for that is the literal meaning of the word in the Greek—"a change of mind" which leads to salvation, to eternal life. The man who thus repents has got somewhat of the God-mind, the God-attitude, towards sin, the God-hatred of sin. He has begun that work of reformation in himself which will one day fit him for the society of angels, nay, for the very presence of the Holy Majesty of the Infinite God. He now shuns the broad way, and walks in that path which ends in glory everlasting. He is in the society of that great company, the Church Militant, who go forth daily, conquering and to conquer, daily fighting against sin within and evil without, until finally he overcometh, and shall inherit all things; "And I will be his God," says the Almighty, "and he shall be My son."

THE Bishop of Marlborough has informed the Bishop of Exeter that he does not intend to resign his Canonry in Exeter Cathedral. The *Exeter Gazette* says the intimation has created great surprise, it having been understood that Bishop Earle intended to resign within twelve months of becoming Suffragan to the Bishop of London. On this understanding the Bishop of Exeter had communicated with another clergyman to whom he proposed to offer the Canonry. Bishop Earle has arranged with Prebendary Hingeston-Randolph to take his three months' duty. Mr. Seale-Hayne, M.P., has given notice that he will ask the Home Secretary whether this is not a contravention of the Pluralities Act.

Certain HARNESS' Cure.
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
FOR
RHEUMATISM
Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh, writes:—"*The Electropathic Belt has* **completely cured** *me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense agony for two years. I now feel strong and active.*"
Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. **Pamphlet & Advice free on application** to **Mr. C. B. Harness,** *Consulting Electrician,* the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
Only Address,
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W. (*Corner of Rathbone Place.*)
Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 13, 1889.

COUNTRY LABOURERS' COTTAGES.

EVEN those philanthropists who devote much time and energy to the improvement of the condition of the dwellings of the poorest classes of our towns have little idea of the unsanitary state of many of the cottages inhabited by the working population of our rural districts.

Some time ago, it was asserted in print by an able sanitary inspector in Oxfordshire, that if the standard cubic space of air required in our workhouses, namely, 300 cubic feet for each adult, were enforced in agricultural labourers' cottages, it would be found necessary to close 80 per cent. of the existing dwellings provided for the accommodation of the poor. This assertion is very startling, but it is fully borne out by the following extracts taken almost at random from the Report of the Commission on Agricultural Employment published some years ago.

"It is lamentably evident, that though much has been done towards remedying the omission of past generations in this respect, a large proportion of the agricultural labourers throughout the country are still housed in dwellings in which they cannot fail to be subjected to great and serious discomfort, and in which the decencies of life are often impossible." . . . "The majority of cottages which exist in rural parishes are deficient in almost every requisite that should constitute a home for a Christian family in a civilised community." . . . "Modesty must be an unknown virtue, decency an unimaginable thing, where, in one small chamber, with the beds lying as thickly as they can be packed, father, mother, young men, lads grown, and growing up girls, two and

sometimes three generations, are herded promiscuously."

In one return, the labourers' cottages are described as "miserable;" in a second, as "deplorable;" in a third, as "detestable;" and speaking of a fourth district, failing to find words expressive enough, the Commissioners remarked that the cottages were "a disgrace to a Christian community."

Turning with a shudder of horror and disgust from these reports, we take up the annual report of a medical officer of health in a western county, and there we come across the following graphic description of the houses of the poorer classes in his locality; not so revolting as those already quoted, but still, showing the necessity of prompt improvement. "Nearly all the houses are built on a level with the ground, or even lower, with a step down into them, and no precaution is taken to put a waterproof course of bricks above the surface of the ground, so as to prevent the damp ascending the walls from the earth. These two oversights make the house-walls and floor damp, the dampness of the upper floor"—the cottages being only one storey high—"being insured by the absence of spouting under the tiles, the dripping from which easily soaks through the thin walls. Another thing that requires attention is, that the bedroom windows are generally so made as not to open. In this way the upstairs rooms are necessarily kept in a foul and unwholesome condition. This, with the lowness of the rooms, makes them very unhealthy. Added to all, we have the crowded state of the cottages, and the dirt and neglect of sanitary arrangements, in many of these small houses." The medical officer of health, whose statesments we have quoted, has to do with what may be considered an exceptionally good district, as compared with many we are acquainted with.

Evidently there is plenty of real work to be done for the remedy of this unsatisfactory conditions of things in the rural parts of England, involving no great individual expense to the respective owners of property, yet sure to be productive of immense and immediate results. With regard to the defective construction of the cottages, it is the obvious duty of the proprietors, either to improve existing dwellings, or to erect new ones. As to the careless, dirty habits of some of the cottagers, that is rather to be attributed to the state of the houses, little better than pig-styes, in which they live. Our experience of the agricultural poor, and it is, by no means, a limited one, is that, similar to the case of his town brother, if you give a working man a comfortable home, no matter how humble it may be, you place him in circumstances conducive to his physical and moral welfare; and that it will not be long before his bettered condition will prove an advantage to those around him as well as to himself. Rural England is not, and never will be, the Arcadia which our poets and novelists delight in depicting; but, at any rate, much may be effected for the amelioration of the dwellings of the agricultural poor, and this amelioration would soon show a remunerative return by diminishing the rates, as well as by promoting the well-being of society at large.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Sunday next before Easter.

We have come to the last Sunday in Lent, and looking forward into the coming week, we seem to feel over us the dark shades of its closing days. We hear, as it were, the cold harsh tones of the Judge; we share with our Blessed Master the agony of that time in the garden of Gethsemane; we catch the harsh roar of the enraged crowd; and more than all this, we *know* in our inner hearts, *what it all means*—"the tender love of God," the sin of man.

We know that our loving Father, moved by Divine sorrow, at the thought of the fate man had brought upon himself by his first disobedience, determined to make a way of escape. We cannot forget that from the beginning the Almighty Counsel had provided that the perfect One should live our earthly life, and carve out a way back to the Paradise we had forfeited. The "One only-begotten of the Father" has offered to take upon Him our flesh; to bear all the sorrows of our human nature, a thousandfold intensified; to die the death of the guilty, that to us might be given the reward of the innocent. And shall all this infinite love and kindness be lost upon us? Shall we, in our stubborn pride, refuse to take the suppliant's place, which is ours by right; refuse to "follow the example of His great humility?" Surely no. God forbid that another Lent, with all its solemn worship, should find us still unchanged; still unrepentant! The way of patience is hard; the road to Heaven is not strewn with roses. Our Saviour told us "through much tribulation" we must enter His kingdom. But let this not daunt us. With God on our side we are *able* for all things. Let us then ask earnestly, that we may have patience, so to run that we may obtain patience, like that of our Lord, to enable us to tread, without complaining, the thorny path of duty; to enable us to bear, without murmuring, the cross which He lays upon us. It is a great gift to ask, but to Him "all things are possible." And oh! let us not forget that this same thorny road is not all! There is a glorious inheritance for those who, by His grace, endure to the end! "To be made partakers of His Resurrection," who would not try to fight bravely for such a reward? Oh! when that goal is attained shall we not feel how paltry have been our sufferings; that our "light affliction has indeed endured but for a moment;" that it is crowned indeed by "an exceeding and eternal weight of glory?"

The *Church Times* understands that a movement is on foot, started by some influential lay people in the diocese of St. Asaph, to provide a pastoral staff for the new Bishop. His Carmarthen friends have presented him with a Bishop's travelling bag, and Mrs. Edwards with a silver tea and coffee service.

A CLERGYMAN'S SECULAR READING.

By the Rev. E. A. WESLEY, M.A.

A Paper Read on the occasion of the Inaugural Meeting of the Denmark Hill Society, at Heatherlea, Denmark Hill.

(*Continued from page* 166.)

From the advantages of secular reading we pass naturally to the choice of books. Of course a man's purchases must largely depend upon his purse, but cheap and useful editions abound, and are on the increase. Cassell's National Library already embraces many useful works. The Camelot Series, the Canterbury Poets, Morley's Universal Library, Bohn's Libraries and other comprehensive courses of reprints, place scores of the best writers within everybody's reach. If necessary, let our favourite authors contest the field with our little weaknesses. We shall value our authors all the more when we get them, for the self-denial they have cost. How charming is the picture of Charles Lamb and his sister with beating hearts, wending their way in wistful uncertainty to the little book shop, where some long coveted volume is exposed for sale, just to see if it is there still, while they are saving up against the happy day when they will come to carry it off in triumph! But now to the question of buying. Richter says, "Books, though they may not be able to man good or bad, certainly can make him better or worse." This consideration makes the choice of good books to a busy man a matter of great moment. He perceives that the higher culture attainable through books consists in knowing the best that has been said and thought in the world. "Culture," Matthew Arnold tells us, "is indispensably necessary, and culture is reading, but reading with purpose to guide it—with system. He does good work who does anything to help this; indeed it is the one essential service to be rendered now to education. And the plea that this or that man has no time for culture will vanish as soon as we desire culture so much that we begin to examine seriously our present use of time. It has often been said, and cannot be said too often, that give to any man all the time that he now wastes, not only on his vices—when he has them—but on useless business, wearisome or deteriorating amusements, trivial letter-writing, and he will have plenty of time for culture. Some of us waste all of it, most waste much, and all of us waste some." Time may be likened to the Sibylline leaves that increase in value as they decrease in bulk; we must therefore be good money changers, and buy up these golden opportunities, these odd snatches, while we are waiting for this or that,—these precious minutes we waste on unproductive trifles. "I have often been astonished," says Sir John Lubbock, "how little care people devote to the selection of what they read. Books, we know, are almost innumerable; our hours for reading are alas! very few. And yet many people read almost by hazard. They will take any book they chance to find in a room at a friend's house; they will buy a novel at a railway stall if it has an attractive title; indeed I believe in some cases even the binding affects their choice." Dr. Johnson's rule—framed perhaps, behind the little counter in his father's old book shop in Lichfield, where he used to squat with piles of musty literature about him, devouring the heart out of books like a young vulture—was to assimilate just what took his fancy, and this habit he carried out through life. "What we read with inclination," he says, "makes a strong impression. If we read without inclination, half the mind is employed in fixing the attention; so there is but one half to be employed on what we read. If a man begins to read in the middle of a book, and feels an inclination to go on, let him not quit it to go to the beginning. He may perhaps not feel again the inclination." By custom we shall acquire the art of discovering what we want in a book without wading through it all, and become members of that little brotherhood of happy souls whom Coleridge describes as resembling the slaves in the diamond mines of Golconda, who casting aside all that is worthless, retain only pure gems. To begin then with the daily paper which we must read to keep abreast with the times. Never let us read that without a pair of scissors handy to cut out any paragraph of permanent interest. Ten minutes ought to dispose of it. "Dear uncle Toby," cries Tristram, "don't go into the sentry box with a pipe; there's no trusting a man's self with such a thing in such a corner," nor trust a parson in slippers with his chair in front of the breakfast room fire, and a paper in his hands. He wouldn't get up from such a posture under half an hour, not even to oblige a bishop. Seriously however, much paper reading by reason of its discontinuity destroys the the faculty of concentration, and impairs the memory. Let the magazines then come in review. These are better for reading in proportion as their articles being longer, demand more protracted application, and make a deeper impression on the memory. But these, too, must be read with discrimination, and only the best articles of the best periodicals, notes being taken for future use.

Novels should be selected which contain vivid portraiture or powerful description rather than plot, which to the clergyman is a matter of secondary importance. Essays furnish him with a wide and productive garden, whence he can pluck many useful herbs and flowers. He will read the books of good letter writers, for the personal revelations they contain, and their useful every-day diction. Books on nature will often be in his hands, and be valued for their sympathetic touches, and their abundance of homely illustration. He will read the lives too of celebrated men in all ranks of life, to learn how they "grappled with their evil star." In the playwrights he will gain exquisite glimpses of human nature,

and the revelation of human weakness he would seek for in vain amongst the Theologians. His own town and county histories will give him telling introductions and impressive points. If his studies run into historic channels, he will find a thousand delights greet his eyes as he floats along its stream. Nor will he neglect the diarists and autobiographers with their curious humours: Pepys, Reynolds, Cellini, Mojeska; and the poets, whose name is legion. Books of science—not little manuals, twenty years stale, nor goody-goody harmonies of Darwin and Moses—but honest treatises on things as they seem to be to men who are trained to see them, these will be often in his hands. But, perhaps, most useful of all, that marvellous mine of wealth—the books of travel, which can never be exhausted. But of lists of one hundred best books, there are plenty. The best books for a clergyman's purpose are the ones he knows best, and the best to know are those that he has noted in his own reading as referred to most frequently in notes and allusions by the best writers. He should keep a list of "legenda" on his table, always handy, and be as greedy to add to it as a Philistine to augment his spoil.

To get together a good library, we ought to begin betimes. Half the pleasure of a library is derived from watching it grow; besides, we shall read our books better if we read them as they come in. Not that it is always easy to be buying books. "If one is a collector," says a witty writer in the *St. James's Gazette*, "and if one's wife is not, it will be easily understood that smuggling across the domestic frontier is a service of difficulty. An amateur does not blazon forth his purchases on his shelves—a married amateur, that is. He hides them away, like a dog with bones, and, like the same animal, often fails to find them again." Here see manifested the advantages of system. Not far from Hawkhurst, in Kent, is a a small pond, which is called in the Kentish tongue "Tub's Lake," from the contraband brandy kegs that were concealed there in good old times. A wise collector has a Tub's Lake in one of Stone's Boxes, marked "pamphlets." No woman ever thinks of looking in there, and the new-bought treasure will be secure from those coast-guard people, the servant girls, whose evil propensities lead them to what they call "tiding up," that is to say, hopelessly muddling the calm waters of literary life.

(*To be continued.*)

Reviews and Notices.

"The Expositor." April, 1889. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

The Rev. T. G. Selby has two papers in this month's *Expositor*, one of which is excellent; the other, in our opinion, exceedingly fanciful. His answer to Professor Huxley is very good; it is in complete contrast in every respect to the *Nineteenth Century* articles, for it is serious while they are flippant, and is thoughtful while they are superficial. But the idea in the other paper, that what was thought to be the sun standing still at the battle of Beth-horon, was really only a second twilight, such as has occurred in our own times after volcanic eruptions, is fanciful in the extreme. To us there has never seemed the slightest difficulty in the narrative after we had once realised that this part is taken from the Book of Jasher, which was a collection of warlike songs or ballads. One sees that the sun standing still is just as much a poetic expression as "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera," and then the whole difficulty vanishes. At any rate second twilights will not explain it.

Professor Ramsey has another very able paper on Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia; and Professor Bruce continues his exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Archdeacon Farrar's paper on St. James is wordy, but the words are of a reasonable length, and the ecclesiastics of old (who are dead and cannot reply) are only moderately abused.

Professor Delitzsch's observations of his Hebrew Testament is a very interesting paper for Hebraists; and by those who take much interest in the eschatological controversy, now happily resting, it will be found very useful.

Mr. Murphy writes on the parables of the Prodigal Son and the Labourers in the Vineyard; a very suggestive paper, though we do not altogether agree; and Dr. Marcus Dods on Recent New Testament Literature. Altogether it is a good, but not a very good number.

"Egg Cookery. One hundred and fifty ways of Cooking and Serving Eggs." London: Newton & Eskell, 20, High Holborn, W.C. Second Edition, pp 97, 1889. Price 1s.

This little book has been brought before our notice, and which is likely to prove useful to many Housekeepers, as it contains an ingenious number of recipes for cooking eggs in various ways, and to some it may be more especially useful at this season of the year.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

Sir,—The manner in which Mr. Crosthwaite treats the question concerning the real meaning of the Book of Jonah, may be intended either to provoke or to prevent reply. His letter contains so little that most reasonable persons would think requires reply, that one might feel disposed to think that he wishes for none. However, I may be mistaken. Will you permit me to say a few words?

1. "They (myself and one or two more) seem to say that parables are as useful as histories." Much more space is taken up in all the four biographies of our Lord with parables (generally acknowledged to be so) than with deductions from history. I have never till now thought of the reasonable inference from this, that our Lord regarded parable to be actually more useful for conveying instruction in righteousness than history. Mr. Crosthwaite suggests, that if the

history of Jonah be a myth (a very vague term), by parity of reasoning the history of the death and rising again of our Lord is another myth. He makes this suggestion in a seemingly guarded form, but in the loose and illogical form of a "why not?" The argument then is, because one circumstance, received only from a traditional book, the origin of which is unknown, may be unhistorical, therefore a circumstance, the evidence of the truth of which as fact is overwhelming, and impossible to be overthrown except on suppositions which are contradictions of other known facts, is also unhistorical. This is the favourite argument of Mr. Huxley and other cavillers against the Christian religion. The Christian who employs it is surely hard put to it for an argument. I should, however, be sorry to have to suppose that his reverence for our religion is on a par with Mr. Huxley's.

2. "May New Testament language decide which is history and which not? We are told not; that we are not at all to be led by what our Lord or Apostles say." The proper way to state this question is: May the prejudice of those who refuse to listen to evidence, and to reasoning on that evidence, and who insist that their own reading of New Testament language, and no other reading, can be right, decide, etc.

3. "Which comes to us as much in the form of actual history as anything possibly can do." The Book of Jonah comes to us in the form of actual history (rather a curious way of describing the literary status of a book) in the same way as the books of Livy come to us. I suppose it is now pretty generally received that Niebuhr's estimate of Livy as an historian is on the whole correct. This insistance on *actual history* can only be persevered in at the cost of the practical depreciation of the spiritual value of the Book of Jonah.

4. "The German rationalistic treatment of the Word of God makes utterly without authority every narrative in either Testament." I had thought that the results of modern Biblical criticism, which I suppose progressed faster at first in Germany than in England, have been to place the authority of the Bible on a very high pinnacle. Modern criticism, if I understand correctly, seeks not to destroy authority, but to discover what kinds of authority, and what degrees of those kinds, belong to the various scriptures of the Bible. Authority is not, as the writer seems to think, in its necessary nature rigid and unappealable, like that ascribed to the Pope.

5. "Things cannot rest as they are. Every honest man," etc. Things never do rest for long at one point. In this particular matter, Biblical criticism is unmistakably progressive. Your correspondent, if he has any knowledge of the subject, would put that knowledge to a good use by giving your readers the benefit of it. Does he mean by his appeal to honest men that every one who differs from him is not honest? Or does he mean that every honest man ought to have an opinion on the Book of Jonah, and stick to it through thick and thin? If he means the first, I really am not ready with a reply; if he means the second, let him furnish us with something that has at least some semblance of reason and sense towards forming an opinion. He says that the narratives of the prodigal and of the rich man and Lazarus are evidently parables. What is there evident about this, if parable is to mean something that did not actually take place, as the writer supposes? The case of the young man that wasted his life and his property and repented may certainly have really occurred, and no one has a right to say that the conversation between the soul in Hades and Abraham did not really occur.

6. "Unless they will openly pose as infidel writers, shaking all faith, and confirming none." This implies, if it has a meaning at all, that faith in the death and resurrection of our Lord is inconsistent with belief that the Book of Jonah is an allegory? the very doctrine of the infidel.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

8th April, 1889,

REV. R. DIXON'S SERMON.

SIR,—In the PULPIT of the 6th inst. you publish a sermon by this gentleman. I may say it is of the usual sort, neither better nor worse than hundreds of similar ones preached every Sunday throughout the land, and are no doubt intended to instruct the ignorant. But I should like to know what the gentleman means by the following:—"The Almighty never allows the wills or machinations of men or devils to clash with His divine purposes." Does this sagacious curate live in the planet Saturn, or in some other abode, "where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest?" He cannot, one would suppose, know anything of the goings on in this world—this every-day wicked world of sin. Is there not a perpetual clashing of evil with good around us, and has it not ever been so? What brought about the fall of man, and what the flood, but the clashing of evil with God's divine purposes? For even a sceptic would not believe that God created man merely that He might show His power by destroying him. And what was the meaning of the forty years wandering in the wilderness? was it not caused by the clashing of man and devil, if you like, with God's purposes? In fact the history of the world reveals hardly anything but a constant and perpetual battle between good and evil—between God and the Devil; and whatever your preacher may say to the contrary, it is an incessant clashing with God's "divine purposes." For His purpose is that all men should be happy, and they are not happy; that all men should be saved, and they are not saved.

I would advise Mr. Dixon in future to deal in facts and not in platitudes, and it will be better for him and for his hearers.

JOHN A. WALKER.

Dublin.

REMARKS ON A SERMON.

SIR,—Your printing a sermon and sending it through the world, is a testimony to its orthodoxy. I don't suppose that clergymen offer their sermons voluntarily—at least I suppose that they are submitted for your approval, and that they carry this approval with them. Allow me, then, to remonstrate against one or two remarks in a sermon contained in your number for April 6th.

1. At p. 160 the preacher, speaking of baptism, says: "He is to baptise infants, not as if the mere external ordinance must necessarily avail." But does it not necessarily avail? I don't mean to eventual salvation, but to the infant being "made a member of Christ, a child of God, and inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." If not, the whole Catechism and the Baptismal Service is all wrong.

2. Baptism does not necessarily avail for these ends, the sermon says, "but as the visible sign and seal," not of the certainty of the infant's forgiveness and adoption—but "a sign and seal of the admission of believers (in the abstract) into union with Christ, which believing parents are privileged to claim for their infant children as well as themselves." Baptism, then, is not a means of adoption for all the baptised, neither is it any pledge that the baptised infant is so adopted.

3. The deacon, if fit, is to believe that the great change has taken place in his own heart; that he has been born again of the Spirit, that he has come as a sinner to the Saviour, and received from Him the forgiveness of sins and eternal life. Here conversion and being born into a new family are mixed up together, in a way quite unorthodox. Every infant is by the Holy Ghost adopted into God's family, and pardoned. This is the regeneration of the Prayer Book. This alone can the clergyman assert at the font—this alone he can thank God for. For a clergyman, meaning by regeneration the conversion which may possibly take place in after life, to assert it as having *now* taken place, and to thank God for it, is perfectly monstrous. A Jew might just as reasonably thank God for our Lord's coming, which he believes is future. So much for the farce of declaring all infants converted. But the case of adults is, if possible, worse. The man is brought up to the font, because already converted, and yet the clergyman, meaning conversion by regeneration, prays that the man may be converted over again. If not, he cannot mean conversion by regeneration; yet he declares that he does, and that so does the service. I am sorry to have to criticise a well-meant sermon, but it is really necessary that our sermons should not contradict the Catechism and the Baptismal Services—sermons at least which have not only been preached in our churches, but, like this, have some peculiar authority. It was preached before the Archbishop at his ordination. It was to instruct a new deacon; and it now comes forth with the imprimatur of your widely read and respected PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

C.C., V.-G.

P.S.—I wish your readers to know that such divinity is not universally adopted in the Irish Church; though in accordance with it, it was attempted to revolutionise our Prayer Book under the Revision mania.

THE BARBICAN MISSION TO THE JEWS.

SIR,—In reference to an advertisement that has recently appeared in the religious papers, to the effect that the Barbican Mission to the Jews had ceased to exist, we are instructed to ask your kind assistance in making known to all who are interested in the Lord's Ancient People, that arrangements have been completed for carrying on the work under the superintendence of Mr. C. T. Lipschytz, who has been for some time connected with the Mission, and will be assisted by a council of reference and acting committee.

GORDON CALTHORP, *President.*
EDMUND A. WESLEY, *Hon. Sec.*

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Abraham, Rev. Charles Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Christchurch, Lichfield.

Barrett, Rev. D. W., M.A., Rector of Chipping Barnet; Chaplain to the Barnet Workhouse.

Bishop, Rev. E. H., Vicar of St. Paul's, Poole; Rector of Hampreston, Dorsetshire.

Briggs, Rev. E., M.A., Curate of Humanby; Vicar of Misterton, Notts.

Bulmer, Rev. W,, Vicar of St. James's, Gloucester; Vicar of Buckland, Faringdon.

Burton, Rev. A. D., M.A., Vicar of Shirley, near Southampton; Vicar of Casterton, Kirkby-Lonsdale.

Chancellor, Rev. Robert Blair Maconochie, M.A., Vicar of Otley; Perpetual Curate of Farnley, Yorkshire (by dispensation).

Crozier, Rev. James Alexander, M.A., Rector of Coston, Leicestershire.

Evans, Rev. Thomas, B.D., Rector of Syresham, Northamptonshire.

Farler, Rev. J. P., Archdeacon of Magila, Zanzibar; Vicar of St. Giles's, Reading.

Foster, Rev. C. J., Curate of St. John's, Liscard; Rector of North Huish, Ivybridge, Devon.

Gough, Rev. E. Spencer, Vicar of Burley, near Leeds; Rector of Barningham, near Barnard Castle.

Jones-Bateman, Rev. P. Lisle, Archdeacon of Zanzibar.

Lindow, Rev. Samuel, Curate-in-Charge of Catterick, Yorkshire; Rector of Bowness-on-Solway, Cumberland.

Lloyd, Rev. John, Vicar of Penboyr; Vicar of St. Peter's, Carmarthen.

Mortimer, Rev. R. A., Curate of Colyton; Rector of Roborough, Devonshire.

Scott, Rev. A. L., M.A., Missioner of St. Andrews in the Diocese of Salisbury; Vicar of Derry Hill, Calne.

Streeten, Rev. Septimus, M.A., Missions to Seamen Chaplain for Great Yarmouth Harbour.

Sutton, Rev. Meyrick J., Vicar of Kirton-in-Holland, near Boston, Lincolnshire.

Thornton, Rev. Dr., Hon. Secretary to the London Diocesan Conference; Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Vowler, Rev. S. N., Vicar of Fingringhoe, Essex.

Walsh, Rev. W., of the London Diocesan Home Mission; Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Warner, Rev. H. J.. M.A., Curate of St. Matthew's, Stonehouse; Vicar of Brixton, Devonshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Best, Rev. James Kershaw, for twenty-three and a-half years Vicar of the parish, at Lane End Vicarage, on the 5th inst., aged 77.

Bloxsome, Rev. William H., M.A., twenty years Rector of Mawgan and St. Martin, Cornwall, at Mawgan Rectory, Helston, on the 6th inst., aged 52.

Bradshaw, Rev. Francis Sands, LL.D., late Rector of Spanish Town, Jamaica, at Flamstead, Dewhurst Road, West Kensington Park, on the 8th inst., aged 79.

Browne, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Christ Church, Oxon, formerly Chaplain R.N., at 34, Britannia Road, Southsea, on the 23rd ult., aged 79.

Hall, Rev. William D., for twenty-seven years incumbent of the Lea, near Ross, at Abbenhall Lodge, Micheldean, Gloucesteeshire, on the 1st inst., aged 73.

Kennedy, Rev. Benjamin Hall, D.D., LL.D., Regius Professor of Greek, Camb., and Canon of Ely, at Shiphay House, near Torquay, on the 6th inst., aged 84.

Lefevre, Rev. Philip Alfred, M.A., of Oak Walk, St. Peter's, suddenly, on the Fourth Sunday in Lent, in his 63rd year.

Milne, Rev. Henry, M.A., for forty-five years Rector of Holme Hale, Norfolk, at Heene, Worthing, on the 28th ult., aged 73.

Overton, Rev. Charles, for forty-eight years Vicar of the parish, at Cottingham, on the 31st ult., aged 83.

Portal, Rev. George Raymond, M.A., Rector of Burghclere and Honorary Canon of Winchester, at Burghclere Rectory, Newbury, suddenly, on the 5th inst., aged 61.

Seager, Rev. John Osborne, at Springfield, Stevenage, on the 4th inst., on his 82nd birthday.

Shepheard-Walwyn, Rev. Clement Carus-Wilson, M.A., Rector of the parish, at Seacombe Rectory, on the 30th ult., aged 42.

Somerset, Rev. Fitzroy George Henry, at Llantarnam, Monmouthshire, on the 7th inst., aged 36.

Underwood, Rev. William David, at West Wittering Vicarage, Sussex, on the 7th inst.

The Church of England Pulpit.

A NINETEENTH CENTURY REFORMATION.

By Professor T. G. BONNEY, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S., Hon. Canon of Manchester.

Sermon Preached at St. Peter's, Vere Street, on Sunday, April 7th, 1889.

"We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of His majesty."—2 Peter, i. 16.

SOME time since we were told in a well-known work of fiction that it was the duty of all thoughtful persons in the present generation "to reconceive the Christ." Quite recently certain general indications have been given—a detail of some importance previously omitted—of the grounds which have rendered this duty imperative.*

They result from a new method of treating ancient history, which has been gradually developed during the last half century. It is called "historical translation." The name is slightly vague, but that is one of its recommendations. In our new philosophy names often take the place of thoughts, and bear much the same relation to them that in some impecunious States a paper currency does to the precious metals. However, call the new method what you will, it amounts to this. It is "the transmutation of past witness into the language of the present." It is the discovery that the actors in bygone scenes were not shadowy abstractions, but flesh and blood, heart and brain, men of like passions—in all senses of the word—with ourselves; with their own theories of life and its relationships, whether to the seen or to the unseen, and that till we realize this, and can throw ourselves back among them, we have no chance of understanding the men or their doings. This is effected by "the use of that same faculty, half-scientific, half-imaginative, which in the rendering of a foreign language enables a man to get into the very heart and soul of his author, to speak with his tones and feel with his feelings."

As a general principle, I believe the above to be perfectly sound. To myself it is no revelation, for in my humble way I have always endeavoured to put it in practice when reading either history or a foreign language. But it sounds novel, and perhaps needs asserting with emphasis because it is a reaction against two currents of opinion, one of which is only ceasing to be, and the other still is, very strong in this country. The former was set up by the revolt against the elaborate system of tradition and dogma upheld by the Church of Rome. Sound in principle, this revolt unfortunately led to mistaken views as to the function of inspiration, to exaggerated ideas of the authority of Scripture, and to a barren and inexpansive system of theology.

The latter is due to the so-called Catholic revival of the past half century—itself a reaction against the last-named tendency. In this the effort to substantiate the existence of an ideal church in the earlier days of Christianity has fostered a method of treating history, which is often disingenuous, and always unscientific. As a reaction against these tendencies, as an honest endeavour to find out the truth about things, instead of what we would like to have true, I for one have no disposition to quarrel with the new school of historical study.

But I demur to some points in its method, and question its consistency when it undertakes this task of reconceiving the Christ. On these I wish to make a few remarks this morning. Historical translation, we are told, effaces the ideal Christ; it practically settles all controversies as to His nature by declaring that Jesus was a mere man, though of deeper spiritual insight and higher moral stature than most other men, that He indeed was crucified under Pontius Pilate, died, and was buried, but that He did not rise again from the dead.

To this conclusion we shall come, we are told, when we bring ourselves to realise the inadequate criteria to which in those days testimony was submitted in all matters supposed to be included in the sphere of the supernatural. Yet more, a critical examination of the documents which profess to be historic, discloses so many variations, such numerous discrepancies, that their evidence is inadmissible in favour of any point, which, on *à priori* grounds, we regard as improbable. In accordance with this principle we determine that the history of Jesus, as related in the four gospels, is to a great extent legendary, though to what extent the disciples of the "higher criticism" seem to me to be curiously at variance. The facts, for which Paul vouches, are merely the fancies of a highly enthusiastic and credulous disciple.

Facts or fancies, this much however must be admitted, and it really narrows the issue, that about a quarter of a century after the death of Jesus, the legend—as they hold it—of the incarnation and resurrection were enthusiastically believed, certainly by a large portion, probably by the whole, of the Christian Church. Hence the four gospels either represent the prevalent belief of the Church at this epoch or were written during the next generation to support this view of the nature and history of Christ. The latter clause of the alternative is

* The references in this paragraph are to the well-known novel "Robert Elsmere" and to an article from the same pen, entitled, "The New Reformation," in the *Nineteenth Century* for last March. The passages quoted hereafter are generally from the latter.

maintained on the ground that the Pauline conception of Christ was very different from that entertained by the other Apostles, the companions of Jesus, but that it prevailed in the struggle for existence, and became accepted as the universal teaching of the Church. Of any such conflict, on so vital a question, there is no evidence of any value, while there is much, as it seems to me, which, though indirect or negative, has the contrary tendency; moreover Paul asserts unhesitatingly that his "Gospel," *i.e.*, his view of Christ, was identical with that of James and the leaders of the other school. But, we may be told, this assertion rests only on Paul's authority. Yes, and now comes in the principle of historical translation. I endeavour to throw myself back into this age of the infancy of the Church; to feel with Paul and his contemporaries; and I come to this conclusion that, even if he were an enthusiast, he was a clear-sighted man as to the significance of points of difference, that he had a very high standard of action and lived up to it, and that in those days telling a lie would have meant the loss of all his influence as a pillar of the Church. So I accept his statement, the more because I cannot discover in history any traces of a rupture on so vital a question. The difference which undoubtedly did exist between the Pauline and Petrine parties, and it was for a time a grave one—was exactly that which under the circumstances might be expected — viz., as to how far, if at all, the Mosaic law was binding upon Christians. To some extent new wine had been put—and this was inevitable—into old bottles, and the safety of the instruments was thereby endangered. The difference between Paul and his opponents might be illustrated by that which at the present day exists (to use party names) between an evangelical broad churchman and an extreme high churchman. Both heartily and sincerely accept the Nicene creed, but to the latter many rites, ceremonies, and ordinances appear to be of the highest importance, which to the former seem often only sentimental fancies, and not seldom productive of very hurtful results.

Again in applying this principle of historical translation to convert into shadowy legend what have hitherto been regarded as substantial, though perplexing facts—which is done by indicating from internal evidence the incredibility of the story—we must be careful to adopt one precaution which, as it seems to me, has been neglected by the school of "the higher criticism." We must judge historians by the standard of their own age, not by that of the nineteenth century. So when critics, who desire to discredit the historical authority of the gospels and other early Christian documents, dwell upon the incompleteness of the narratives, upon the vagueness of their information as to certain matters now deemed important, upon their discrepancies, upon the difficulties in making out a connected story, they are really falling into historical anachronism, not employing a true method of historical translation. Our critic, in fact, sits down to his task like a professional reviewer, and cuts up the unfortunate author for not conforming to a code which had no existence in his days. The early Christian writers were not men of high culture; literary art was probably the last thing of which as a rule they had any thought; matters which to the antiquarian would be of the highest interest, which would subtend a large angle in the view of the nineteenth century historian, were to them of small concern. They dwelt upon the topics which for some reason or other were prominent in their minds, and were guilty of omissions which no doubt would bring confusion of face to a modern biographer. To myself the rather bald and fragmentary character of the narrative in the gospels, the marked contrast between them and such religious romances as I know, is one of the strongest proofs of their genuineness, and the very discrepancies, so obvious and patent, indicate the veracity of intent on the part of the writers, and the good faith of the early church. Even in this enlightened nineteenth century, when, as we may presume, the utmost care is exercised and the best intentions prevail, we do not find histories or biographies always in perfect accord, and are furnished by our purveyors of news with much information which it would be flattery to call accurate.

But it is further alleged, the unique pre-eminence claimed for the Christ, disappears when we obtain a better understanding of His historical background. He was the product of His age. Much is said as to the additional knowledge which has been obtained of late years, concerning the state of thought in the Jewish or Gentile world some nineteen centuries since; but, so far as I have been able to ascertain, this supplies details rather than it alters principles. Jesus can only be claimed as the result of latter-day Judaism in the sense in which Wiclif or Luther might be termed the product of mediæval Catholicism; and in His case there is no evidence to show (but there is some to disprove) that He had sat much at the feet of the doctors of the law. In His teaching there is little sign of the influence of Grecian philosophy. Indeed, seeing that the great master of the Alexandrian school was only His senior by about twenty years, it is hardly likely that the former would so speedily have obtained much hold on the distinctly conservative mind of the Palestinian school of Judaism. In the earlier books of the New Testament few, if any, indications of the doctrines of Philo can be discovered, though we can hardly doubt that they were familiar to the author of the gospel and epistles attributed to St. John.

That in a very true sense Jesus was the product of His age we should not dream of denying, because He was truly man, and every man is and must be this. Perhaps sometimes in adoring the God made manifest in the flesh, it has been forgotten that

the godhead was conditioned by the manhood. The mystery of this combination of the infinite and and the finite we do not attempt to explain; but we do not hesitate to affirm that (sin only excepted) Jesus was as each one of us. The ordinary arts, the ordinary knowledge of daily life must have been acquired by Him, with effort and toil, as by every son of man; defect of perception, failure of memory, all the consequences of fatigue and sickness, and the like must have been as possible to Him as to us. It was only in those intuitions and influences which we are wont to call spiritual, that He differed from erring and fallible man. This distinctive characteristic we may believe, strengthened with His advance in years, as the instruments —the human organism and nature—became more fitted for its exercise; so that, in a certain sense, the Man upon the cross was more divine than the Babe of Bethlehem. Granted that Jesus gathered to Himself all that was best in Judaism—nay, in the past history of man—I defy anyone to demonstrate that His doctrine can be traced back either to the subtleties of the Rabbis or the schools of Alexandria. But some will say, Of Jesus we know little, the doctrine is the invention of His disciples. Of all the hypotheses, freely promulgated to avoid being forced to admit the possibility of the miraculous, this appears to me the most unscientific. I find for it no trace of any historical support; inductive treatment of our materials seems to point to any conclusion rather than to this.

But I pass on to notice, lastly and briefly, what seems to me a self-contradiction in the new philosophy. We find it, for example, in the following quotation: "We must submit to the education of God. The revolt against miraculous belief is becoming now not so much a revolt of reason as a revolt of conscience and faith." On the statement in the latter clause I have not now time to dwell, so I leave it with the remark that it sounds very like the consecration of the spirit, which has been satirically represented as speaking thus:—

> What there is to know I know it,
> What I know not is not knowledge

But I maintain that the passage which I quoted, as a whole is self-contradictory. I am told to "submit to the education of God." The education of God! but I thought reason—aye, and conscience too—forbade me to believe in a miracle. When you name God you imply miracle. Of Him I know nothing of myself. I can discover nothing in the world; the term implies ideas which cannot be tested by my senses; it is a mere hypothesis, a probable one perhaps, but nothing more. Of Him I can only know by revelation; and this, since it cannot be included in the natural order of this world, is miracle.

I do believe in the education of God. I see that "through the ages one increasing purpose runs." I behold this working ever towards one end in the speculations of Greek Philosophy, in the "Persian and Parsee conceptions of an unseen world" in the Jewish "passion of the Messianic hope"; and I see all these concentrated, focussed, manifested in one unique personality, by whom each deepest and noblest aspiration of the human soul is satisfied, by whom life and immortality are revealed. This belief may be a mistake, but it is at least consistent. You, in talking of the education of God, can only escape inconsistency by asserting that your mind has fathomed the Divine purpose, your knowledge is omniscience.

You tell us of a coming reformation. Yes, in that you are a true prophet. I too have watched and wait for its approach; even now I can see the golden glow of dawn, brightening behind the clouds which have gathered in the eastern sky. But the reformation is not that of which you dream. True, it will purge and in some respects transform theology by the infusion of the scientific spirit. It will be another step forward from the bondage of the letter and the ordinances of men; it will bring down to their true insignificance questions which have agitated and injured the Church, whether they concern the "washing of cups and platters" or the differences of dogma devised by human ingenuity; it will lop away, or at least reduce to its rightful dimensions, the parasitic growth of centuries; but before its light the Christ of Christendom will not vanish as the morning mist, for it will enable us, with a truer simpler, more child-like faith to walk with Jesus, not as man only, but also as God, beside the margin of "Genesareth or in the streets of Jerusalem."

ST. PATRICK.

By the Rev. R. R. KANE, LL.D., Rector of Christ Church, Belfast.

Sermon Preached at the Cathedral of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, Downpatrick, on Sunday, March 17th, 1889.

"Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase." —1 Cor. iii. 5.

EMULATIONS and strifes arose at a very early period in the history of the Church. Here was one amongst the Corinthians which the Apostle interfered to compose. Some would give pre-eminence to Apollos and some to Paul, and the wonder is St. Paul did not remind the disputants that the pre-eminence really belonged to Peter. I take leave to think if that princeship for which the Roman Catholic Church so eagerly contends as a matter on which its very life hangs had been known to St. Paul, and had been believed in by the Christians of his time, he would have hastened to remind the Corinthians that the pre-eminence in dispute was the prerogative of

Peter, and therefore could not be claimed either by himself or Apollos. A more remarkable incident still of the same kind we have in the Gospels, where the disciples disputed amongst themselves which of them should be the greatest. Christ Himself composed the dispute. And how did He do it? Did He say, "I have made Peter your chief, your prince; he is the head, and all ye are to be submissive to him"? No; but He took a little child and set him in the midst, and said, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye can in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." And He proceeded to rebuke in very strong terms the spirit of pride and of ambition which they had evinced, never giving the faintest hint that anyone of them was to have any sort of precedence with respect to the others. Now, we Irish Christians to-day commemorate the work and the virtues of our national apostle, the eminent servant of God, who was the principal instrument in God's hand of converting the people of this island to the faith of Christ. And, divided as we are into separate and conflicting communions, we dispute with one another as to which of our communions has the best right to claim St. Patrick. It is, no doubt, an important and crucial subject of debate from one point of view; and, if we could divest ourselves of a partizan spirit, and proceed in the discussion animated by a sincere desire to arrive at the truth, the additional light which has been thrown of late upon the history of St. Patrick should prove of great value and material assistance to us. I sincerely hope, my brethren, that all our discussions may be conducted in a spirit of charity, which is the only spirit consistent with the religion of Christ, and that no eagerness of disputation will hinder us to-day offering our most fervent prayers to Almighty God on behalf of our country, and of our countrymen of every name, that they may know the truth, and that peace and happiness may soon bless and characterise our native land. We of the Church of Ireland do not attach the vital importance to this question that our Roman Catholic brethren do. If it could be proved that St. Patrick in the fifth century preached the supremacy of the Pope and all the distinctive tenets of the Church of Rome, we should say, "Yes, but did St. Patrick find what he taught in the Word of God? If he did not, we are not bound to accept it simply because he taught it: whatsoever cannot be proved from Scripture will not be accepted by us as an article of faith, though it came to us stamped with the authority of an angel from heaven." Our appeal is to the Word of God; and so long as our religion can be shown to be agreeable to the Word of God, we shall never, I trust, allow ourselves to be moved away from it. When we come to show that our religion in all its main points is identical with the religion of an ancient Christian teacher who lived subsequently to the Apostle's time, we are simply joining issue with our opponents on what they believe to be their vantage ground—we give them the great advantage of choosing their position, and we fight it out with them in that position. There can be no rational doubt of the existence of St. Patrick, though the authentic sources of information with respect to him are very few and meagre. We have two or three tractates which are believed to be from his own pen, and these, with the history of the Church which he founded, are the only means we have of judging of his opinions.

In his confession St. Patrick gives an interesting account of his life, and some particulars of his family. He informs us that his father was a deacon, and his grandfather a priest, which item of information itself reveals to us that the domestic and social life of the clergy of those early times was very much the same as that of the clergy of the Church of Ireland in our own time: but we may assume that no one pretending to any acquaintance with ecclesiastical history will dispute that celibacy was imposed upon the clergy at a comparatively late period, and then it was imposed with the manifest object of advancing the ambitious designs of the Roman Pontiff. St. Patrick further tells us of his birthplace, which has been somewhat satisfactorily settled as being the place now known as Dunbarton. The Roman Empire in Britain was disturbed by the warlike Picts and Scots, and to prevent the incursions of these troublesome enemies the Roman wall was built, extending from the Forth to the Clyde. In connection with the military duty on this wall, a considerable population was collected from various parts of the empire, chiefly, as we can easily understand, from the neighbouring province of Gaul. The family of our saint belonged to this Roman military colony, and were resident at the western extremity of the wall on the Clyde, and held an influential and official position amongst the colonists, as is indicated by the name Patricius, which was a title of distinction and not a patronymic, and also by the fact that the father of the Saint was a decurio or magistrate, as well as a clergyman.

Now, the Picts in North Britain were assisted in their raids upon the Roman colony by the Scots in Ireland, for the people of this country were called Scots in those times, and from time to time the Scots carried away into captivity some of the Roman colonists out of Britain. In one of these raids St. Patrick, when a youth of sixteen, was carried into slavery. For six years he served as a a herd in the neighbourhood of Ballymena. We can, with almost absolute certainty, walk over the ground consecrated by the affecting spiritual experiences of that slave boy who became the herald of the Gospel of Salvation to the nation by whom he was held in bondage. The youthful Patrick looked upon his captivity as a chastisement from the hand of God. He had led a life of wilfulness and sin, and had been deaf to godly counsel and

example, and on this account he reflected God allowed him to be carried away captive. There is nothing more remarkable in the *confessio* than the account St. Patrick gives us of his spiritual life at this time. We have, indeed, in his simple pages laid bare to us a soul stricken with a sense of sin, and earnestly struggling into new relationship with God, and new manner and purposes of life. "The Lord discovered to me," he says, "a sense of my unbelief; that, though late, I should remember my transgressions, and I should be converted with my whole heart to the Lord my God, who regarded my lowliness, and had compassion on my youth and ignorance, and took care of me, before I could discern or distinguish between good and evil, and protected me and comforted me as a father would a son." This is the language of true evangelical repentance. A survey of God's goodness induced this repentance, and he was humbled and horrified at his ingratitude. "Though late I should remember my transgressions." A youth of under twenty bewailed himself that he had not earlier turned with his whole heart to the Lord his God, who had dealt with him as a father with a son. That sincere evangelical repentance was a good foundation for the spiritual character of our Saint. You have heard of people building from the top no doubt. It is a bad way of building. These foolish builders do good things, are benevolent, and moral, and devout, but their spiritual character is not built on the foundation of a genuine repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, and hence their building, though fair enough to the eye, cannot stand. But our Saint was a wise man—God help us to copy him in this particular—he dug deep, and built his house upon the rock. We are not surprised to learn that this thorough conversion was followed by great fervour of spirit and zeal of character. "The love of God and the fear of Him grew more and more, and my vigour of mind increased, so that in one day I made as many as a hundred prayers, and in the night nearly a like number; so also when I passed the night in the woods or on the mountains, I was roused before daylight to prayer through snow, through frost, or through rain, and felt no harm, neither was there any slothfulness in me, as I now perceive, because the Spirit was then hot within me." How forcibly such an experience suggests the beautiful lines :—

> The oak strikes deeper as its boughs
> By furious blasts are driven;
> So life's vicissitudes the more
> Have fixed my heart in heaven.

The preparation of Patrick for his great work was very much of the same kind as the preparation of Moses. The day of Patrick's deliverance from captivity came. He was impelled to fly from his place of bondage, and God's providence directed him to where he found a ship and a friendly crew, who took him on board. No doubt he had maturely considered his plan of escape, and the character of the persons trading at the port to which he made his way, and that his highly wrought feelings suggested to him supernatural voices and visions, which were largely his own highly-coloured thoughts and plans, as to how he could best escape. He was safely landed in Gaul, and after an adventurous journey he found his way to his own kindred. An uncle was then Bishop of Tours, and under this relative he studied with a view to the ministry, and was ordained by him. St. Patrick could not forget the beautiful country which was dear to him as his native land. It was the land of his second nativity, and sacred to him as the place where he, a captive and a stranger, had found a communion sweeter and more blessed than that of father brother, or friend—where he had walked with God. In his ears there was perpetually a voice calling him to the scene of his former captivity, to labour as a herald of the Gospel. In spite of the dissuasions of his friends he was obedient to that voice. "Thanks be to God," he says, "that after many years the Lord granted to them according to their cry."

St. Patrick does not give us any detailed account of his work, but we gather from his pages that his success was immediate and marked, and that God gave him the Irish people to be his joy and crown of rejoicing in the day of the Lord. His career has been tracked in Ireland by means of the agreement of all the lives of the Saint on some salient points, while, as reliable histories in detail, they are utterly incredible. It is believed that he attempted to land at Wicklow, but was driven off and sailed along the coast, touching at some accessible points, until he landed at Strangford Lough. St. Patrick and his companions proceeded to explore the country. They were mistaken for pirates, and, an alarm being given, the chieftain Dichu went out to meet the invader. This chieftain was converted, and gave the ground on which he met the Saint for a Church, where was built what was called "Patrick's Barn," whether because it was in the shape of a barn, or because the chieftain's barn had originally stood there or not, we don't know, but there the first church was built by St. Patrick in Ireland, say in the year 432, so that the parish church of Saul has a very ancient and a very enviable history, indeed. St. Patrick was eager to turn his steps to the scene of his former captivity in Antrim, and after a short visit there, which was not without spiritual results, he proceeded in his missionary work, preaching Christ and ordaining clergymen, and making converts with marvellous success, but not with a success which we are unable to understand when we remember how he was endued with power from on high, and how, with his whole heart and soul, he gave himself to the work. "It were tedious," says St. Patrick, "to recite all my labours singly or in parts," and in my discourse it would be impossible to recite the labours of St.

Patrick in detail. It will suffice to remind you that with Christian daring he assailed Paganism in its headquarters. He preached at Royal Tara, and his mission received at least the patronage of the King Leoghaire, while many members of his court and family were converted. At Armagh he found the high place of Paganism, and he made it the chief seat of the Church which he founded in Ireland. He visited every part of Ireland with unvarying success, and, after his abundant labours, he retired to spend his declining years in Saul, where he had built his first church. Here, in the year 492, he rested from his labours on the 17th of March.

Legend-mongers have been very busy with the whole life of St. Patrick, from his baptism to his burial. At his baptism the priest who was called to officiate was blind, and there was no water, but the infant's finger made the sign of the cross on a rock, whereupon water sprang forth, which not only served for the sacrament, but cured the priest of his blindness. On the occasion of his death the sun stood still over his grave for a whole year, and this highly favoured district enjoyed a perpetual day. We are told his wish was to die at Armagh, and be there interred, but an angelic voice sent him back to Saul, announcing that the four petitions he had asked of God had been granted—(1), that his jurisdiction should have its seat in Armagh; (2), that whoever repeated at the hour of death St. Sehnal's hymn in his honour should have Patrick as the judge of his repentance; (3), that the descendants of Dichu should receive mercy and not perish; (4), that Patrick, as the Apostle of Ireland, should be the judge of all the Irish in the last day, according to the promise made to the other apostles, "Ye shall sit upon the twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." This last "grant" is so like the whole teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. We are to go to Mary to intercede with her Son for us, suggesting that Jesus is not as compassionate as Mary? And we have obtained as a privilege that Patrick will judge us, suggesting that he will be a more merciful judge than Jesus Christ. The burial of Patrick was a subject of much contention. The men of Armagh wished to receive his bones, and the men of Down wished to retain them. The matter was settled according to biblical precedent. Two untamed oxen were yoked to the cart which bore his body, and, being left without human guidance, they stopped on this hill where your Cathedral is built, and here we are to-day on a spot very sacred in the eyes of Irish Christians. Towards this consecrated spot Irishmen all over the world turn to-day with very sacred feelings? Would that our hallowed respect for the memory of the blessed dead, and our gratitude to God for his Apostolic labours, might lead us to bury our discords and the foolish dream of some of us that happiness and glory are to be found along a path on which truth and virtue and charity cannot accompany us, and that the conviction might arise within us all that the happiness of Ireland and the glory of Ireland will be best secured by the spread of the Gospel which St. Patrick loved and devoted his life to proclaim and propagate.

There are two things especially to be noted about St. Patrick's *Confessio*, to which I shall refer very briefly this morning. We must notice in reading this short tractate how full it is of quotations from the Holy Scriptures. Evidently the author had a great reverence for the Word of God, and was intimately acquainted with that Divine Book. The same remark applies to the other tractate which has come to us from the pen of St. Patrick. Every rebuke, every warning, every exhortation is enforced with a most apt quotation from the Holy Scriptures, as when he says to Coroticus, "It were a long task to discuss or make known one by one, or to pick out through the whole law testimonies against such cupidity. Avarice is a mortal crime; thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods; thou shalt not kill. A homicide cannot be with Christ; he who hateth his brother is a murderer; or, he that loveth not his brother abideth in death." Familiarity with the Word of God, and deference to the authority of the Word of God, mark the writings which we have from St. Patrick; and if any community of our time claim to have descended from the Apostle of Ireland, let that community emulate the reverence of St. Patrick for God's Holy Word. We, on our part, are ready to stand or fall by the judgment of God's Word on what we teach. The Bible is our rule of faith. The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible is our religion. We believe that what is contrary to the Word of God cannot be true. Jesus Christ says, "Thy Word is Truth," and what is contrary to truth cannot be true, and we believe that all necessary truth is contained in the Bible. If we want to prove a doctrine or a practice we preface our proof with the formula, "Thus saith the Scriptures." And I believe in this particular we demonstrate our affinity to St. Patrick!

The other thing to be specially noted about St. Patrick's tractates is the absence of reference to the Pope or the Roman See. It is very possible, indeed, that he had no quarrel with the See of Rome, as at the time Rome had not provoked opposition either by corruptions of doctrine or by grasping at power; but the modern Roman Catholic, who believes the supremacy of the Pope to be a cardinal and essential article of the faith, will be disappointed and surprised when he fails to meet, in all the writings of St. Patrick, with a single intimation that he was in the least aware of such supremacy, and his disappointment and surprise will be increased when he discovers that for seven hundred years subsequent to St. Patrick the Irish Church maintained its independence of Rome, stoutly disputed with Rome on some points, as the

time for the observance of Easter; and a famous Irish Bishop is found addressing a strong letter to the Pope, in which he plainly taxes a predecessor of the Pope with being a heretic, and the fountain-head of a scandalous schism! The modern Roman Catholic will be surprised when he meets all this, that is, if anything can surprise a man who has subscribed to the proposition that the Pope is of right, and has ever been the spiritual monarch of the whole Christian world; for there is nothing in the history of the world more easily and distinctly traceable than the growth of this assumption on the part of the Popes; and, so far as the British Churches are concerned, there is no era more plainly marked than that which saw the introduction of Papal usurpation. The era which saw the Saxon power in England superseded by the Norman is plainly marked, but not more plainly than that which saw the ancient liberty of the British Church fall before the setting up of Papal usurpation. The era which saw the introduction of English dominion into Ireland is plainly marked, but not more plainly than the era which saw the introduction of Papal power into this land, which for at least seven hundred years previously had been a Christian land. But we shall have an opportunity of pursuing this subject this evening. God knows as an Irishman, speaking in this ancient seat of Irish Christianity, I should vastly prefer speaking words of conciliation and peace to words of controversy, but words of truth must be spoken, whether men will bear or whether they will forbear. An English Canon wrote recently that the sin of England against Ireland is written "with the point of a diamond." And possibly it is, too, for did not England in the time of Henry II. force the Pope upon Ireland, and in the time of Elizabeth refuse to give the Irish people Divine Service and a sermon in the language which they understood. And if England were now led away by party passion to give Ireland over to civil war, she would commit another sin against Ireland which should be written with the point of a diamond. Mistakes in the past cannot be atoned for by a huge mistake now, and to grant what is called Home Rule would be a mistake compared with which all the errors of the past would be mere bagatelles! Let our prayers to-day ascend in real earnest on behalf of our country that God may bless her people with the love of the truth, that they may be saved.

THE enthronement of Dr. Edwards, Bishop of St. Asaph, has been arranged for noon on the 25th inst., St. Mark's Day.

THE Bishop of Truro, after consultation with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and in deference to the strongly expressed wishes of the clergy of his diocese, has decided to postpone the question of his resignation until he has tried the effect of the rest that his medical advisers have ordered him to take. Arrangements are being made for carrying on the work of the diocese during his lordship's absence.

PAMPHLET and Advice FREE

Every man and woman in search of HEALTH should write without delay to Mr. C. B. HARNESS, *Consulting Medical Electrician* (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his *New Medical Work*, entitled "Harness' Guide to Health," which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of Harness' Electropathic Belt and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper.

MR. C. B. HARNESS also gives Advice Free of charge (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(*Corner of Rathbone Place.*)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 20, 1889.

CHURCH AND SECT.

THE Church can be but one. It may have its national divisions, its patriarchates comprising different nationalities. It may exist with a difference in dioceses of the same federation or archiepiscopal province.

But it is always one as a Church, and each part of it is in practical and visible unity, so long as it continues to be one with the original foundation. No local or sectional variations, so long as they do not violate this condition, can break the unity.

This is the Church idea. The sect idea is a modification of this, which has been by time metamorphosed into a very different thing. All sectarianism began by the assumption that its own seceding body was the one and only true Church of Christ, as the boat's crew putting off from a wrecked ship consider themselves to be still the ship's company. This was, at the first, the only reason for sect existence. Each sect believed then, for the time being, that it was still one with the original Church, and the only representative of it. That which it left behind was no longer that Church, was a wreck which had ceased to fulfil the purposes and retain the character of a ship.

By imperceptible degrees this idea has been abandoned, and in its stead has been taken up that of a right or independent existence, justified by an invisible and spiritual tie with the source of Church life. But this modified idea does not include the re-assumption into its own communion of all those other bodies to which a sect now concedes a place among Christians. It looks at them as invisibly one, as visibly distinct, and for this separation it falls back upon the notion of an independent

right of formation, so far as visible features are concerned.

That is to say, the sect idea, pure and simple, rests upon the notion of the power of any set of Christians to associate themselves under such conditions as shall please them. To this idea, in many of these bodies, there is opposed in them that which is a remnant of the Church idea. Some hold to the Bible alone as necessary, and, of course, receive the Scriptures as that portion of their inheritance in the original Church. Others add to these the Sacraments, and others, again, add the Creeds. So far as, respectively, they possess these they are not sects, but portions of the one Church. Their separation from it is the separation which results from incompleteness.

But the Church in England is one—and every baptized person is a member of it. Some are hindered in their proper recognition of this by incompleteness, some by excess of requirement, as where they add conditions improper and unnecessary, for instance, papal supremacy and infallibility.

To the acceptance of the Scriptures, the Creeds, and the Sacraments, there must be added the historic episcopate, because that is the connecting link with the past, and the sign and proof of a continuous existence. It is necessary to the other three, because to each of these it gives their true place and right in the life of the Church.

Now any who will admit these four is at once, by this very fact, in the true place of membership of the Church, and may, if so disposed, continue in the old religious associations to which he has belonged, provided they are willing to retain him. At the same time he at once depresses these into the rank of mere voluntary religious clubs.

Thus a man may be a member of the Young Men's Christian Association, or of the "Christian Community," or any charitable society, and yet be fully a member of the Church. But in his Church membership he perforce makes these associations just what they are, voluntary societies. So the denomination adopting the four points becomes part of the Church Catholic, and relegates its denominational peculiarities into the second place. Thus the Methodists would by this step simply resume the place they held before they were stupidly and cruelly crowded out of the Church of England. Then their Methodist practices, the "methods" from which they derive their name, would be no longer signs of severance and points of essential consequence, but the more or less useful and praiseworthy features which any set of Christians might assume for their spiritual benefit.

THE Bishop of Durham, who was consecrated the eighty-first Bishop of the see on April 25, 1879, attained the age of sixty-one years on the 13th inst., having been born at Liverpool on April 13, 1828.

A CLERGYMAN'S SECULAR READING.

BY THE REV. E. A. WESLEY, M.A.

A PAPER READ ON THE OCCASION OF THE INAUGURAL MEETING OF THE DENMARK HILL SOCIETY, AT HEATHERLEA, DENMARK HILL.

(*Continued from page* 178.)

A LIBRARY takes its tone from its owner, of whose mind it is index and exponent. His hobby is there writ large, and this is fair enough. But after satisfying a special taste, the man who wishes to possess a good library should, in the first place, secure good copies of the greatest authors in all the prominent departments of literature which his country has produced." It is a disgrace to apply to a public library for books that deserve to be read and re-read. Fancy applying to Mudie for a Shakespeare or a Milton, a Don Quixote or a Waverley Novel: for Boswell's Life of Johnson, or Lockhart's Life of Scott." (Payne).

Doubts may be entertained about the propriety of subscribing to Mudie at all, for the £3 3s. buys a good many useful books; and a volume on the shelf is worth two in Oxford Street as a book to work with. That brings us to another essential of a good library—works of reference. It is a function of the Charity Organization Society to supply a basket of tools to a poor man out of work. Were the management to unbend so far towards the poor and deserving parson as to set him up with the Encyclopædia Britannica or the English Cyclopædia, Stevens' Biography, Philips' Gazetteer, Webster's large Dictionary, and a few other tools of that sort, they would earn his eternal gratitude. But as the need is pressing, perhaps it will be well not to postpone a few necessary purchases till that era of enlightened liberality arrive.

A word must be said here with regard to what are called "books of the day." Every season brings some book to the front, which everybody talks about, and if it happen to have a religious aspect, like "Robert Elsmore," the clergyman is sure to be asked for his opinion. He must therefore submit, now and then, to the exigencies of the occasion, and apply himself to second-rate books, over which he would naturally spend very little time, for the sake of encouraging intellectual conversation and meeting current doubts. Under exceptional circumstances he may feel it his duty to render himself acquainted with the writings of prominent Agnostic, Unitarian, and even infidel writers, although he may not choose to add such works to his library.

Having thus treated generally of the class of books which should be found on a clergyman's shelves, and of those he should inform himself about, we pass to the best methods of study for

one whose time is limited and whose requirements are both special and peculiar. To a large extent a clergyman's reading must necessarily be desultory: it is encouraging, therefore, to reflect that so great a scholar as Dr. Johnson admitted that desultory reading was by no means without its advantages. But desultory reading must not be purposeless; a busy man cannot afford to lose time in that way. When he takes up a book he must have an object, when he lays it down he must have attained that object. "Reading without a purpose," says Bulwer, "is sauntering, not exercise. More is got from one book, on which the thought settles for a definite end, than from libraries skimmed over by a wandering eye. A cottage flower gives honey to the bee, a king's garden none to the butterfly." It is a good plan to talk over a book when we have read it, or to write out a brief abstract of what we remember best. We do not treat our illustrious authors well, if we do not sometimes recall their memories. Better make a friend of one book than be on bowing terms only with half-a-dozen.

But we are met with the ever-recurring objection of having no time. Now we all know what surprising results have been accomplished by systematic work. System is the familiar spirit of the able clergyman. It accompanies him, like Michael Scott's demon, wherever he goes; but it asserts paramount authority in the library. Our ideal parish priest is an indefatigable note-taker, and the notes he takes he thoughtfully classifies for future use. Nothing to him is more exasperating than a fugitive idea buzzing, mosquito-like, about his head, which he cannot catch nor trace home; a something he has heard somewhere, but he does not know where, and cannot verify. He knows that many a pithy saying and many a telling point may be missed through want of system. He is perhaps acquainted with professing disciples of Captain Cuttle, who not only take notes, but know what is worth taking a note of, who are yet unable to find the note when they want it. Therefore he encourages his demon, and strengthens his hands. In every book he reads he places a few slips of paper, cut to uniform size, and on them enters whatever strikes him in the reading, it may be an extract, or merely a note of the subject, with the title of the book and page. Thus, suppose him to have Mr. Lowell's pleasant essays on hand, "My Study Windows," and to light upon the passage relating to the modesty of President Lincoln in suppressing the pronoun "I." He will take note of this by transcription or page reference. When he has done with Lowell, he carries off his slips to a box for classification, and places that relating to the personal pronoun in a quarter where it has for company say, a reference to Kingsley, a note from Goethe, and another from Novalis. Years afterwards, when these isolated notes have passed from memory, wishing to write on the subject, he takes down the box, and has material ready to hand. It will be apparent that a sound method of classification is of the utmost importance, if this is to be done readily. The order of the alphabet will be the method that first comes to mind, but this alone is unsatisfactory. The clergyman does not want his notes separated by an arbitrary literal distinction. In his mind the pronoun "I," "egotism," "self-consciousness," "The Autobiography of a Snob, by one," "obstinacy," and Thackery's "Book of Snobs" have a subtle sort of connection, and if he wants one he wants them all, at least to choose from; but the chances are he will not recover them from an alphabetical arrangement. Let him try to classify into groups thus, employing an alphabetical method under those heads when the notes are numerous:—

1. God, Holy Trinity, Divine Attributes, Bible.
2. Heaven, Hell, and Future State, Spiritual World, Death, Sleep.
3. Nature, Descriptive and Scientific notes.
4. Man, in relation to God, Prayer, Devotion, Worship, etc.
5. Man, Passive and Recipient, Suffering, States of Life, Providences, Coincidences.
6. Man, Character, Mingling of Virtue and Vice.
7. Man, Virtues, Vices, Defects, etc.
8. Man, Physical.
9. Man, Mental, Memory, Will, Understanding, Emotion.
10. Man, Special Occupations, Trades, and Professions.
11. Man, General Occupations, Letters, Reading, etc.
12. Man and Society, Influence, Labour; Man and Woman, Etiquette; War and Peace, National Customs, Statistics.
13. Children, Religion, Training Schools, Chat, Advice, Innocence, Wit, Sunday School, Faults, Sufferings, Distinguished.
14. Wit and Humour;

and so on, making such headings as he considers will be most handy for reference. Stone's Boxes are very useful for keeping the groups distinct, a separate box being reserved for each heading, the notes being kept in subordinate groups in envelopes, neatly lettered and alphabetically arranged in the box.

A clergyman who requires all his notes for pulpit purposes sometimes employs an interleaved Bible; but this is a vicious method, leading to great waste of labour. If the plan must be adopted, let the Bible be that published by Messrs. Griffin, where the passages of Scripture are placed under subject-headings (the Classified, or Analytical Bible).

Others who prefer MS. books to boxes for their notes will paste the slips in volumes bearing upon the same subject, number them, and enter them in a carefully prepared index. Both methods are good, but the boxes save the labour of indexing. It is well to carry a supply of slips for taking notes

upon in the pocket, in case we drop in at the library, or pick up an odd book while waiting at a friend's house.

Considerable difficulty may be experienced at first in determining what headings are most suggestive for the chief sorting, and everyone must, in this matter, act upon his individual judgment; for no two human minds are alike, and the object is to place notes so that we may refer to them at a subsequent period, when our minds have been passing through a different channel. No captious or whimsical assorting will answer this purpose. Our classification must be based, as far as possible, on the intrinsic nature of the things noted, and having adopted a method we must stick to it till practice makes the sorting easy. Every note should have clearly written at the top the chief subject it contains. When the note embraces two or three subjects, additional slips should be made out, with a reference to the note which contains them, and deposited in appropriate places. No hints can be given as to what to note. Many of the points which strike us forcibly at one period of life, cease to do so when the mind is more developed; but this consideration need not deter anyone from commencing the task. Housekeepers say that if you throw anything away you are sure to want it within a week. This is certainly true of notes. We never know what we may want, and had better err on the side of keeping too many than too few.

It is obvious that the methods of note taking and note keeping here suggested are equally applicable for the memoranda of our theological reading. Perhaps it is best that all should mingle together like the beasts in the sheet let down to Peter in the vision, for our able clergyman recognises no distinction between profane and sacred. All things are cleansed by the purpose for which they are used, and as the pastor, obedient to the exhortation in the ordination service, "draws all his studies this way" —that is towards practical usefulness in his parish —he can call nothing that is worth reading and remembering, either common or unclean. Over the chamber of his brain there preside two fixed purposes that dominate his thoughts, and rule and direct his studies. The first asks "What light does this passage shed upon the ways of God, the thoughts of God, and His immutable purposes concerning the human race?" The second "What can be gathered here that will reach human hearts struggling with sorrow and sin."

Under the presidency of these grave thoughts, his reading cannot be light and frivolous, cannot grow purposeless or vague. In the quest of knowledge, dominated by such considerations he is ready to endure hardship as the good soldier of Jesus Christ. Commenting upon the passage in Ecclesiastes "Much study is a weariness of the flesh," Adam Clarke, a giant among scholars, breaking through the studied impersonality of commentator and critic, writes "O how true is this! Let the trembling knees, the palsied hands, the darkened eyes, the aching heart, and the puzzled mind of every real student declare! And should none more worthy of the name of student be within reach to consult, the writer of this work is a proof in point." Yet, never did this painstaking servant of God refuse to leave his books at the call of public duties, or for the ministration of private charities. In weariness, sometimes, and painfulness must the scholar pursue his path; but as he journeys through even the dry and waste places of literature, his hearts burns within him, walking with Christ; and in that sweet company the wilderness and solitary place rejoice and blossom as the rose.

Reviews and Notices.

"Jesus Christ the Divine Man; His Life and Times." By Rev. J. F. Vallings, M.A. "Men of the Bible Series." London: James Nisbet & Co.

So many valuable works have been written on this great subject, that before taking up Mr. Vallings' book we must confess we prepared ourselves for some measure of disappointment. This expectation, we are pleased to say, was not realised, and though modest in its pretentions the book deserves to rank high amongst kindred efforts.

The writer's object is to treat of our Lord's earthly life "in its organic spiritual unity and moral relation," and it is therefore foreign to his purpose to dwell upon the historical side of the subject. Much controversial matter is thereby avoided with much gain to the reader.

We regret that the energies of so many of our best men should be employed in meeting attacks upon the historical foundation of the Bible. Perhaps it is unavoidable; but if every point in dispute were settled in favour of Christianity to-morrow, we doubt whether a single member would thereby be added to the Church of Christ.

The growth of the Church must depend upon the extent of our insight into spiritual truths, and Mr. Vallings helps us to study these truths undisturbed.

The style, especially of the earlier part of the book, is rather overloaded with technical expressions, otherwise it is terse and pointed, and every page is full of instruction. We strongly commend the book to our readers.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY.

Sir,—I am induced to write a line or two on the above subject by Mr. Walker's letter. He takes exception to Mr. Dixon's words, "The Almighty never allows the wills or machinations of men or devils to clash with His divine purposes." He does this because He sees much evil in the world, and this in conflict

with the good. My object in writing is that of suggesting that God is a Sovereign, and that we ought not to forget this truth. I am not sure that Mr. Walker had it well before his mind when he penned his letter.

There are many problems connected with our existence here that we cannot solve. We do not know—we can only guess—why God permits evil. There is much evil in the world. The "whole world lieth in wickedness." This fact is only too patent. God is a Sovereign Lord. Why does He permit the evil? He could stop it all. Why does He not?

We may not gainsay the truth of the Sovereignty of God. To do so would be to deny His existence. We cannot think of God as not omnipotent. He is the Self-existent One—ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ὤν. I suppose no one wishes to deny this fact.

Well, but if it be true, then Mr. Dixon's position is justifiable—the will of men and devils cannot contravene His will. How can it? Ingenuity cannot possibly devise a way.

A kindred doctrine—and one very difficult to reconcile with the foregoing—is that of man's responsibility. Man is responsible for every act that he does. We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ to give an account of the deeds done in the body. We could not be judged save only on the supposition that we are responsible for our conduct.

To focus the whole matter, take the case of Pilate. He judged and condemned the Lord Jesus. The condemnation was against the dictates of conscience and the warning of his wife. He wavers considerably. It would appear that God's purposes of love and mercy were on the point of failing. The Crucifixion, humanly speaking, depended on his villainous cowardice. And he hesitates! God produces the vision and the dream. What is this for? To intensify the responsibility? Yet Pilate passes the sentence. God's purpose is fulfilled. And so He makes the wickedness of the wicked to glorify Him.

It is quite clear, then, that we must assert man's responsibility and believe God's Sovereignty, and not for a moment suppose that, though men may rage, God's purposes will not stand.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, April 13th, 1889.

THE CRITICISMS ON SERMONS.

SIR,—Some of your correspondents criticise sundry sermons that have recently appeared in the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT. One attacks Mr. Kerr-Smith's sermon on Our Lord's first miracle with the insinuation, which is quite gratuitous and scarcely even decent, that the preacher wishes to startle people. He ends his letter with an objection to upsetting "uninterrupted notions on such subjects"; continuing, "the old landmarks being removed, all doctrines," etc. This is the only case in which I have observed any one calling notions landmarks.

Mr. Walker asks what Mr. Dixon means by a passage from the sermon that he cites. If he reads what goes before, and what comes after the passage, I think he will find no difficulty in understanding it; and if he alters "clash with" into "defeat"—no great stretch of imagination is required for that—the passage is comprehensible without any context, and I think quite unexceptionable.

I can imagine the amused smile with which many will see Mr. Hewitt, of Rathgar, accused by "C. C., V.-G.," of unorthodoxy, and of teaching contrary to the Prayer Book and Catechism. The writer of the letter bases this charge on Mr. Hewitt's words, that baptism "is a sign and seal of the admission of believers into union with Christ"; on which he makes the comment, "Baptism, then, is not . . . any pledge that the baptised infant is so adopted." To use "C. C., V.-G.'s" expression, this is "perfectly monstrous," for a sign and seal are a pledge, and admission into union with Christ is adoption.

B.

SIR,—So many letters have recently appeared in your paper remarking on sermons, that I am encouraged to ask your leave to correct one or two historical errors into which Mr. Lloyd has fallen in his sermon in to-day's PULPIT.

Archbishop Becket did and suffered nothing to mitigate the cruelties of feudal jurisdiction that I ever heard of. He did his wicked utmost in opposition to royal authority, which was the natural enemy of feudal jurisdiction. He was a rebel and a truce-breaker.

Sancroft contributed something towards the Revolution without knowing it; but there was no man in England who did more than Sancroft to prevent its actual accomplishment.

I suppose the allusion to the crisis which the French clergy have experienced refers to the suppression of some religious communities a few years ago. Those communities are not *the clergy*, although most of their members were, I suppose, clergymen; neither are those communities the Church or a part of it, unless a wen, blain, boil, or disease is part of the man who suffers from it. The Church of France is all the better for having a set of societies extinguished, the like of which have almost always been enemies of social order and good morals.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

13th April, 1889.

GALLIO AND ST. PETER.

SIR,—I think the temptation of clergy in the present day is to despise the truth, as Gallio did, or to deny it, as St. Peter did. No doubt this is the most sure road to promotion. Colourless is the colour now. A safe man means a man who does not decide between truth and error. This is what St. Peter did. He did not say, "Crucify Him," but "I know Him not—I am not one of this Man's disciples." In Ireland a clergyman's best card is to know nothing about the grace of baptism, or the grace of the Eucharist. They are both utterly tabooed. Touch them not, if you hope for peace or promotion. Erasmus was of this school, but Luther was not. "If a man is ashamed of Me," includes being ashamed or afraid to speak up for the truth. I fear the same spirit prevails in England with all prudent men who hope to rise. If there be such a thing as truth, though it be wise for this world to be quite indifferent between it and error, how will it be when the Son of Man cometh? If a man is too careless to seek for the goodly pearl, or too cautious to barter present gain for it, how will he fare in the end? What shall a man gain, if he lose his own soul, if he

value not, or confess not the truth? When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?

-C.C., V.-G.

THE BOOK OF JONAH.

SIR,—I have read Mr. E. Lawrence's letter, but I can find no answer to the simplest question, How can we know when Scripture records history, when mere myths? If there is no possible line of demarcation, even when our Lord is made out to be mixing up fables and history, as Nineveh and Solomon, then we are a ship without a compass.

2. He is pleased to say that I play into the hands of infidels. How so? I make all our Lord's pretended history real history. Nay, it is *he* who plays into infidel hands. What our Lord refers to as history Mr. E. L. and Co. make out to be fables. An infidel, then, may well say that the histories of our Lord's death, resurrection, etc., being put forth as true, only as much as Jonah, are equally mythical and fabulous.

3. Mr. E. L. calls Jonah "a traditional book, the origin of which is unknown." Why not apply the same terms to any other book in Old Testament or New?

4. We are even plainly told that we are not to judge Old Testament books by anything in the New, either from our Lord's life, I presume, or from the Apostles.

5. Jonah's authority is compared to that of Livy. I do not see why my maintaining the historical value of Jonah depreciates its spiritual value.

6. Mr. E. L. talks of different authorities of inspired books. If inspired their authority is equal. He sets the Bible on a pinnacle, that is, in the clouds or mists of apologues.

7. He asks me for a test between history and parables. I answer, the way in which our Lord speaks in the judgment of all reasonable men. His imagining that there may be facts on which parables are preached is very reasonable, but it is nothing at all *ad rem.* If he cannot decide for himself whether the parables of Lazarus and the Prodigal Son may not be real histories, I must leave him to abound in his own opinion. If they are real histories, that does not prove Jonah, etc., to be parables. I do not think I have omitted to answer any of Mr. E. L.'s arguments.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

THE Bishop of Lincoln presided on Monday, the 8th inst., at a meeting held at Lincoln in aid of the Church Missionary Society, and said he ventured to think that missionary meetings ought to be regarded as a relief, as a refreshment, and as a new invigoration, because he believed there was implanted in every man an innate desire for communion with his fellowmen, and an innate desire for mutual participation in the highest faculties and capacities which were given to men. There was something far higher and more precious than a mere love of enterprise in Bishop Hannington when he went away into Africa—it was, he believed, that yearning for knowing more of one another, that mutual intercommunication and participation of the highest gift which God had intrusted to them. It also seemed to him that missionary meetings were exceedingly valuable as safeguards against some of the dangers of civilisation. They sat at home in their comfortable palaces and houses, and were put out of temper by such a trifling circumstance as the milkman being late—(laughter)—and when they came to listen to people who had been travelling about in canoes for hundreds of miles, where at times there was a temperature of 40 or 50 degrees below zero, it put them to shame. The Bishop of Moosonee also addressed the meeting.

WE are glad to hear that the Bishop of Bedford has finally returned to town from Hastings, much the better for his short rest.

A DEPUTATION, consisting of the Revs. George Griffiths (Llaleston) and John Owen, (Rhos, Ruabon), waited upon the Bishop of Chester at the Palace, last week, and, on behalf of a large number of their fellow-students at Lampeter (of which Dr. Jayne was formerly Principal), presented his lordship with an illuminated address heartily congratulating him upon his consecration. The border of the address was richly decorated, and contained vignettes of Chester Cathedral, front and inside views of Lampeter College, and of the Canterbury buildings, together with the coats-of-arms of Chester and Lampeter. Figures symbolical of faith and knowledge were also incorporated in it.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Arrowsmith, Rev. S. F., Incumbent of Laura Chapel, Bath; Vicar of St. Mark's, Liverpool.
Brown, Rev. Stafford Meredith, Vicar of Horsey-next-the-Sea, Norfolk.
Buttanshaw, Rev. J., Prebendary of Easton-in-Gordano, in Wells Cathedral.
Calthrop, Rev. Gordon, Vicar of St. Augustine's, Highbury; Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral.
Collier, Rev. Canon Charles, Rector of Andover; Rector of Chilbolton, Hants.
Duncan, Rev. J., Vicar of St. Silas's, Byker, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Edwardes, Rev. Henry, Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Elliot, Rev. F. R., Chaplain of H.M. British Legation at Athens.
Gifford, Rev. Henry George, B.A., Rector of East Quantoxhead, Somersetshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Briscoe, Rev. John Dunlop, Chaplain Bengal Ecclesiastical Establishment, at Tangier, on the 12th inst, aged 40.
Chute, Rev. Edward Russell, M.A., of Moulton Rectory, Long Stratton, at London, on the 10th inst., aged 42.
Clarke, Rev. Walter, B.D., Head Master of Derby School at the School House, Derby, on the 12th inst., aged 51.
Gwyn, James Bevan, Priest, late Rector of Rockingham, fell asleep at the 'Trinita de' Monte, Rome, on the 9th inst.
Hodgson, Rev. Beilby Porteus, for thirty-three years Vicar of the parish, at Heartburn Vicarage, Northumberland, on the 12th inst., aged 81.
Lucas, Rev. Charles, J.P., Rector of the parish, at Filby House, Norfolk, on 11th inst., aged 84.
Mitchell, Rev. A. Lurnesden, late Bengal Chaplain, Retired List, at Otley, Suffolk, on 14th inst., aged 54,
Polehampton, Charles Arthur, B.A. of Merton College, Oxford, at Pietermaritzburg, South Africa, on the 1st ult., aged 24.
Reeve, Rev. Abraham Charles, at the Parsonage, Higham, Colchester, on the 8th inst., aged 79.
Thornburgh, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Heywood, at Ventnor, Isle of Wight, on the 2nd inst., aged 53.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

By the late Bishop of LINCOLN.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge.

"Wherefore, seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before Him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God."—Heb. xii. 1, 2.

THIS allusion of the Apostle to the chariot racers in the "Circus Maximus" at Rome, may justify a reference to a somewhat similar spectacle in another ancient city, and may illustrate the subject before us, especially with regard to the festival of Christ's Ascension into heaven which has just been celebrated by us.

In one of the noblest sites in the ancient world, the Acropolis of Athens, and in one of the fairest productions of ancient architecture, the Parthenon, was seen one of the most beautiful works of ancient sculpture, executed by the hand of Phidias and of other great masters of the art.

That work of sculpture was a frieze, running along the northern and southern sides of the Temple, and representing a religious procession, called the Panathenaic, of the youthful life of Athens, portrayed in its most graceful forms, riding upon horses, chasing one another in rapid succession as in a river-like flow, and increasing in speed till they reached the eastern front of the Temple, when they faced each other. There they were separated by an interval in which were twelve figures, seated in repose, superior in size to those in motion, six of them facing the north, six the south. These were figures of Divine beings, and formed a striking contrast, by their sedate attitude, to the rapidity of the procession hastening onward toward them. The eager movement of the procession represented the activity of the earthly life; the calm repose of the seated figures portrayed the apotheosis of that earthly life in heavenly peace and glory. To appear in that Divine presence was the longing desire of the Panathenaic procession, and by its eagerness to attain to that dignified calmness as the goal of its emulous rapidity, it seemed to display the passionate craving of youthful life to pass from the feverish restlessness of earth to the eternal peace of heaven.

My younger brethren, may I not be allowed to combine the imagery of these two spectacles, that of the Circus Maximus, referred to by the Apostle, at Rome, and that supplied by the religious procession sculptured on the frieze of the Parthenon at Athens, as descriptive of your own life here? You are engaged in a race; in a Christian Circus Maximus; with a heavenly prize before you. You are here also, moving rapidly, we may hope, in a sacred procession, to appear before the Divine presence, and, in both respects, the exhortation of the Apostle is applicable to you in your course. "Let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us." Presented to your eye of faith there is the Divine presence of Christ to which you are hastening. There is the calm and majestic apotheosis, if we may so speak, of our common humanity in the royal dignity of our ascended Lord, seated on His heavenly throne and wearing the crown of life; and, in His infinite love to you, inviting you to be sharers in His glory. He says to each one of you in the Apocalypse, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life,"—Rev. ii. 10, and, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on My throne, even as I overcame and am set down with My Father on His Throne"—Rev. iii. 21.

Bear with me, brethren, for saying that such exhortations as these, not inapplicable at any time, seem to be specially seasonable now. No one can doubt that a new era for good or evil has now dawned on our Colleges and Universities. The new codes of their statutes, which have been lying on the tables of both Houses of Parliament during the present month, cannot fail to be fruitful in great results. Whether those results will be for good or evil depends, under God, mainly upon yourselves, and especially upon you, my younger brethren. They will be what you make them. A breaking up of ancient principles, and an abandonment of time-honoured practices is imminent, it is inevitable. Our forefathers did not look on the Universities as mere secular emporiums, in which knowledge is to be bought and sold for temporal profit, or material advantage, or for earthly enjoyment, and personal aggrandisement. No, they regarded them as holy temples, in which science and literature were consecrated to God, and were inspired with hopes full of immortality, and in which men ministered to Him with holy worship, and in which they looked upward to Him for the outpouring of His grace in prayers, and sacrifices, and sacraments, and in which they looked forward to the advancement of His glory, and the eternal welfare of mankind as the aims and ends of their existence, and from which successive generations went forth to serve Him in the Church and Realm of England, and to bring blessing and honour upon both.

The watchwords of our Universities, "Dominus Illuminatio mea," "Hinc lucem et pocula sacra,"

are witnesses of this consecration. But such sentiments as these seem to have found little favour with some of those who have undertaken the arduous task of reforming these venerable institutions. The results of their work will soon appear. Let us pray God that the Church and nation may not have cause to rue it, but be benefitted by it. But, brethren, what is done by us ourselves under such circumstances? What, then, is to be done by us? This is not so easy to say. But one thing certainly ought not to be done. And what is that? Let us not despair.

We may be on the eve, not only in our Universities, but in our Church and Realm, of some great disruption. Be it so. Let it be even as great as that of the Roman empire in the fifth century. What was then the view taken of that crisis by great men?

There were two opposite schools of thought. There was the school of St. Jerome, who gave up all as lost. "Quid Salvum est, si Roma perit? in una urbe totus Orbis interiit."

But on the other side there was the school of Augustine * and of his followers, Orosius and Salvian. Goths and Vandals, Franks and Burgundians were, it is true, in their view, instruments of God's wrath, and ministers of God's judgments, not only on the heathen world, but on a corrupt and degenerate Christianity; but they pointed with thankfulness to the fact that many were chastened and purified thereby. Society was stirred to its lowest depths, men were sifted and winnowed. Their personal character was tested. Many fell away, but others stood the trial nobly. The Church was glorified by martyrdoms, especially in the Vandal persecutions in Africa. The sacking of Rome by Alaric produced illustrious examples of heroic courage and suffering. Families were uprooted from their ancestral possessions, but the instability of all worldly things made them look upward. The turmoil of earth reminded them of the calm of heaven. The ruin of Rome made them think of Jerusalem that is above. The passing away of the Empire of the Cæsars led them to meditate on the kingdom of Christ, which will never be destroyed. Many who had been lovers of pleasure, now became lovers of God. They who had doted on this world's wealth, now became rich in faith. Roman patricians, honourable matrons, who traced their lineage from Paulus Æmilius and the Scipios; and even from Æneas and Agamemnon, quitted their gilded palaces, and consecrated their wealth and devoted their lives to Christ, in the building of hospitals and asylums, in the foundation of religious houses, in the endowment of brotherhoods and sisterhoods. St. Jerome himself, who wept over the ruins of Rome, profited by its fall. A stream of the riches and piety of Rome flowed into his monastery at Bethlehem, and cheered him in his learned labours on the word of God. And St. Augustine's greatest literary work was one due to the fall of Rome, and when his own city, Hippo, was besieged by Vandal armies, it raised the eyes of Christendom from the fading triumphs of the city of this world, to the immortal glories of the City of God.

Yet, further, the new world came into contact with the old. The rude barbarians of the North were brought within influence of Southern civilisation, and within the fold of Christendom. Christian missions were set on foot, fresh life was infused into the languid decrepitude of the Roman empire, by the immigration of hardy and vigorous tribes from the North that sowed the seeds of those mighty kingdoms, famous in arts and arms, which afterwards adorned its ancient cities with Christian colleges and churches. A similar process may perhaps be now produced among ourselves. We cannot hope to retain much which we dearly love and justly prize. The support of venerable laws, the props of ancient precedents, are giving way beneath our feet. But when public protection sinks, private energies emerge. Great men live above laws. Churches survive Parliaments; when national institutions perish, prophets and heroes arise. When the Church of Israel was disestablished by King Ahab, Elijah stood forth on Carmel. When the Temple was in ruins and God's people in exile, a Jeremiah, an Ezekiel and a Daniel shone gloriously in the national gloom. So it may be with us. It will be our own fault if it is not so in our Church, in our Colleges, and in our Universities.

Brethren, consider this. In the marble terminus of the Panathenaic frieze at Athens, heroes are divinised, and the view of their glory, seated in calm immortality, stimulated its ancient heroes the youthful racers in their course. And the Apostle to the Hebrews, having in the eleventh chapter, displayed what we may almost call a sacred Panathenaic frieze of ancient worthies and martyrs of the true faith, opens the twelfth chapter of this Epistle with the stirring appeal to his hearers, "Seeing we also are encompassed with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us."

Those ancient witnesses of the faith who had stood alone in a faithless world, proved by their examples that religious heroism is possible in the worst times, and that such virtues are evoked and stimulated by the world's secularism, and win the noblest victories then.

So it may be with us. Our Colleges may be secularised by law. But no laws can secularise our hearts, except by our own fault. No one can rob us of our magnificent past. Men may abrogate our statutes, but they cannot cancel our history. It is stereotyped for ever. Let us look at the cloud of witnesses by which we are encompassed, and

* St. Jerome Prolog. in Ezekiel.

which rains down a golden shower of glory on our heads. If we are disposed to flag and falter, because we imagine we are left alone to do battle for the faith, let us think of them. Think of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, speaking of judgment to come. Think of Noah building his ark. Think of Lot, a preacher of righteousness to the cities of the plain. Think of Abraham leaving his home for a strange land, and becoming the friend of God and father of the faithful. Think of Joseph, alone in Egypt. Think of Moses standing before Pharaoh. Think of Joshua and Caleb witnessing to God when the people took up stones to stone them. Think of Elijah alone on Carmel. Think of Micaiah, the son of Imlah, alone among the false prophets of Ahab. Think of the three children in the furnace at Babylon alone, and yet not alone, for one like the Son of God was with them. Think of Daniel at his prayers, and in the lion's den. Think of the courage of the aged Priests, Mattathias on his death-bed, and Eleazar on the rack, in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes; think of the valour of Judas Maccabæus and his brother in those evil days, and of the heroic mother and her seven sons rejoicing to be martyrs of the faith in the hope of a glorious resurrection. Think of John the Baptist before Herod Antipas. Think of St. Stephen before the Council at Jerusalem, and looking up to heaven in his martyrdom and transfigured with heavenly glory. Think of St. Paul singing psalms and hymns at midnight in the prison at Philippi with his feet in the stocks; and think of him before Felix, Festus, Agrippa, and Nero. Think of St. Peter on the cross at Rome; and St. John, an exile at Patmos, seeing Christ revealed in glory. Think of St. Ignatius, his scholar, among the lions at Rome; and of St. Polycarp amid the flames at Smyrna, witnesses to Christ. Think of the faithful women martyrs at Lyons and Vienna, "out of weakness made strong." Think of St. Athanasius remaining firm for forty-seven years, like a rock of adamant, a faithful witness to the Godhead of Christ. Think of St. Basil resisting the Arian Emperor Valens in his church at Cæsarea. Think of St. Ambrose reproving and repelling the Emperor Theodosius at Milan after the massacre at Thessalonica, and defending the Churches of Milan against the Arian Empress Justina. Think of St. Chrysostom at Constantinople to be banished for the truth. Think of our own martyrs, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer in the flames at Oxford. Think of Archbishop Whitgift reproving Queen Elizabeth for sacrilege. Think of the 2,000 clergy who resigned their benefices in the Civil Wars rather than be untrue to God and disloyal to their king. Think of Strafford and Laud, and Charles the First, martyrs on the scaffold. Think of our own Mackenzie in Africa, and of Bishop Patterson in the Melanesian canoe lying with the palm branch on his breast gained by a martyr's death, and a pledge of future glory. Above all, think of Him who is the true and faithful Witness from whom all their graces and glory flowed. Think of Christ before Caiaphas, and before Pilate. Think of Him on Cavalry, who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down on the right hand of the throne of glory.

Suffer me now to make an appeal to you, my younger brethren, by way of practical exhortation.

No greater calamity could happen to England than that the ancient Universities should cease to be schools of the Prophets. It would fare ill with the spiritual health of the nation, and would be disastrous to Christianity at home and abroad, if the study of theology were to languish in our colleges, and were to be divorced from that of philology, and of pure and applied mathematics, and from scientific and literary pursuits. Yet, bear with me for expressing a fear that this may now be the case, and that a large proportion of the future clergy of England may be trained elsewhere than in our two great ancient Universities. Even now there are more than twelve Theological Colleges in different places in England and Wales: and the statistics of our present ordinations shows that relatively the number of candidates for Holy Orders from our ancient Universities is declining, and is now not more than fifty per cent. of the whole.

Do not imagine that I would disparage the work of those Theological Colleges. No; that work is a great work; it is of inestimable value to the Church and nation. But it would be much to be regretted that Theology, as a science, should depend upon these Colleges for its cultivation, and that the spiritual work of the Church, as the Teacher of the nation, should be confined to students nurtured in them; or that those Theological Colleges should, in that respect, be allowed to supplant our ancient Universities, instead of being supplementary to them.

Suffer me, then, to plead with you the cause of Theology, the Queen of Sciences, as our own great philosopher, Francis Bacon, called it, the "Sabbath and haven of all human contemplations." Suffer me to plead with you the cause of one of the most honourable professions of all, that of a Priest in the Church of God, as it was portrayed by Francis Bacon's dear friend and fellow collegian, less illustrious in his own sight for his noble birth from the house of Pembroke, than for his being allowed to serve, as a minister, at God's altar—one of the sweetest and saintliest of scholars and poets, George Herbert. The office of a clergyman in the Church of England offers few worldly advantages; but there never, never was a time when it had such attractions for truly heroic and chivalrous spirits. Look at the missionary fields in India, China, and Africa, whitening to the harvest. Harvest fields they are, and battle fields also, and they have already had power to stimulate the energies of

soldiers of the cross at Cambridge, and in the sister University. And may I point to mission fields nearer home. England is rapidly becoming a great town. Our rural populations are dwindling away, and are gravitating towards our cities. The Church is weak in those towns. Secularism and unbelief are strong there. Their only hope of being won to Christ is by the bands of able, holy, devout, learned, and eloquent Evangelists, such as our Universities are able to send forth. Are there not some hearts here that may be stirred, some spirits that may be fired with holy zeal to join together in this grand crusade?

"Raise up, we pray thee, O Lord, Thy power, and come among us, and with great might succour us." Pour out Thy Spirit upon us, and send forth from this place men full of faith, mighty in the Scriptures, able ministers of the New Testament, workmen that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth; prepared and willing to endure affliction, to do the work of Evangelist, and to make full proof of their ministry.

Yet again. We want indeed missions to the multitude, of poor, vicious and unhappy in our great towns.

But do we not also need missions to the rich and noble? Do we not need missions to those who had been rightly called* "the miserable great?" They are specially entitled to compassion. From their position they are often betrayed by flattery into pride, the mother of ignorance and vice; and they are in peril from daily temptations, and they are rendered less sensitive to spiritual and heavenly things by yielding to those temptations, and by the languor, and lassitude, and exhaustion of body and mind, produced by fruition waiting on the caprice of every random wish, and not purchased by toil.

England needs bold and courageous preachers to the rich and noble. She needs such preachers as John the Baptist and St. Paul, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, and St. Chrysostom. What would they have said to the luxurious voluptuousness, the revelry and riot, the reckless gambling, the profane extravagance of what is familiarly called a London season, at a time when our missionary societies are languishing for lack of funds, and when our great towns are almost lapsing into heathenism? What would they have said to those who move conspicuously in London society, and there set up and worship idols of their own making, thoughts tainted by sins of impurity which God abhors, and who then, perhaps, go forth and hold public meetings, and give lectures to the poor on the duties of temperance, soberness and chastity? What would they have said to the evil influences flowing downwards from the higher ranks to the lower and middle classes of society, and contaminating them by bad examples, and by the scandals of vice in high places, engendering bitter scorn in the minds of the multitude for those above them, and a passionate exasperation against social distinctions of rank, and privilege, and property, and a vindictive eagerness to destroy them? What would they have said to some who ought to be examples of piety and virtue to others, and yet ashamed of acknowledging that it is God who maketh men to be of one mind in a house, in worshipping Him in family prayer; ashamed of owning Him as Creator and Giver of all good things, by invoking Him at their meals, and praying Him to sanctify and bless His creatures to their use; ashamed, for instance, of having family prayer; ashamed of saying grace before meat; but not ashamed of what is shameful, not ashamed of desecrating the sanctity of marriage, and not ashamed of marriages consequent on divorce produced by conjugal unfaithfulness; ashamed of what is noble, and honourable, and glorious, and forgetful of His warning Who said, "Whosoever is ashamed of Me and of My words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of Him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed when He cometh in the glory of His Father, and of the holy angels."

Who can cope with such evils as these? You, my younger brethren, you, by your position in society. Some of you, it may be, are of noble blood, most of you of gentle birth, you can do this by your virtuous example, your moral courage and boldness, your faithful, brave, and loyal confession of Christ before men. You, by God's help, may stay the plague and heal the diseases of English society.

Brethren, a great religious movement—that of the Salvation Army—is now stirring the hearts of the people. It has a message to ourselves. It points to our own shortcomings. We call ourselves a Catholic and Apostolic Church; we speak of the Divine institution of Episcopacy, and of the other two orders of the Christian ministry, and of the spiritual blessing dispensed by their means. We preach, and preach rightly, of the necessity of holy baptism, and the gift of the Holy Ghost in confirmation, and of the privileges of coming to Holy Communion; and of the claims of the Church of England, as dispensing the Word and sacraments to the nation. But what is our present condition? Test it by the statistics of confirmation, to which, according to our laws, every baptized person ought to be brought when at years of discretion; and which is the prescribed entrance to Holy Communion. The present population of England and Wales amounts to twenty-six millions, but of these twenty-six millions not one per cent. per annum is ever brought to confirmation.* This being the case, we need not be surprised the Salvation Army should have appeared among us

* See Burke on the French Revolution, vol. v. page 192, ed. London, 1826.

* The number confirmed last year in all our Dioceses was only 176,464.

and have produced a marvellous impression on our people.

What then is to be done? Are we to surrender our principles? Are we to accept such a form of Christianity, as preaches Christianity, without a Church, without creeds, without sacraments, without any definite sense of the Bible? in a word, without any of those appointed means of grace which were instituted by Christ, and by which the Holy Spirit has vouchsafed to work for eighteen hundred years? This we cannot do. But are we right to be angry—except with ourselves—recollect we ought to thank God that the Salvation Army is awakening us by a startling alarum from our present spiritual slumber to a sense of our duty, and is stimulating us to emulate its zeal and enthusiasm, and to pray to God to fill our hearts with abundant love for those vast myriads whose nature the Son of God has taken, for whom He shed His blood on the cross, and to beseech God the Holy Ghost to come down with great power and might upon us and them, and bless them, and to quicken our faith in Christ's promises to the Church, to be with her for ever, so that she may contend, as He intends she should, be His own Salvation Army to the world, fighting under the banner of the cross with the shield of faith, and the sword of the Spirit, against sin, the world, and the devil! Who among you, my younger brethren, will enlist in *that* Salvation Army? Many and many a battle-field calls now for your courage; many a campaign for victory under the great Captain of Salvation is now opening before you. Let me be allowed to refer to one among many; in the Diocese of Lincoln there is the town of Nottingham; its population has rapidly risen to 188,000. I do not hesitate to say that it demands your missionary zeal and energy, as much even as Delhi or Calcutta. It needs a company of preachers, a band of evangelists beaming with love for Christ, and for the souls redeemed by Him, and with zeal for the glory of God. Who will join together in such a conscription as this? Who will go forth in a glorious crusade to save souls?

Once more. The fall of the Roman Empire, as St. Paul had foretold, made the way for the rise and aggrandisement of the Papacy. And suffer me to say that events which are passing in Europe may lead to a similar result. Some persons seem to regard the Papacy as spent volcanoes. But surely this is a delusion. The very things by which some nations have tried to stifle it, I mean irreligious legislation, have tended to intensify its energies. The dissolution of ancient dynasties, the disruption of political and ecclesiastical institutions, and the consequent spread of lawlessness and unbelief, and antichristian persecutions, and the bold and defiant outburst of profaneness and blasphemy, are filling many men's minds with alarm and awe, are giving a strong impulse to Roman Ultramontanism as a recoil and defence against them.

Few men and fewer women, can live and die without some form of religion, and they are prone to take refuge in that form which is most self-confident and most alluring. And the bitter acrimony and fierce controversies of religious sects have given a great advantage to the spurious claims of Roman unity. Rome is strong by sceptical negations, and by our divisions, and will make a violent struggle before the end. Here is another peril. How is it to be arrested? Limiting the question to our own country, we may answer that our Universities are best qualified for the task. We cannot contend against such a well-organised force as that of Rome, by illiterate zeal, by blind enthusiasm, by ignorant fanaticism, or by the coldness of philosophic speculations, or by a creedless and colourless Christianity, or by discordant sects of yesterday. We need a learned clergy, we require an historical Christianity. We need a Church, such as, thank God, the Church of England is: professing a faith grounded on Holy Scripture as interpreted by the Creeds of ancient Christendom, and tracing her spiritual lineage and ministerial commission, by which she dispenses the Word and sacraments, backward in uninterrupted succession, through eighteen centuries to the throne of Christ her Head, seated in heavenly glory. And in order that such a Church as this may be preserved in Evangelical truth, Apostolic order, and Catholic love, we need a clergy qualified by sound learning, calm and sober judgment, by vigorous energy and well trained ability, and by holiness of life, to defend her, such as this University has never failed to supply, and such, as is devoutly to be hoped, she may send for this purpose according to her need in ever increasing abundance.

Finally, brethren, farewell. Let me entreat you to obey the exhortation of the Apostles, "Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, who for the joy that was set before Him endured the Cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." Look upward to our ascended Lord. Pray to Him for grace. Pray to Him in private. Pray to Him in your College Chapels. And may He enable you to follow His example here on earth, so that you may be with Him, and like Him, in His everlasting glory, through His merits and mediation, to whom with the Father and the Holy Ghost, Three Persons and one God, be all honour and praise, now and for evermore. Amen.

AT the commemoration service of Edinburgh University on Thursday, the preacher in St. Giles's was Bishop Wordsworth, of the Scottish Episcopal Church, who throughout his life, says the *Echo*, has been seeking to bring about a union between the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

By the Rev. J. W. KAYE, M.A., Rector of Derrybrusk, Enniskillen.

Sermon Preached at Derrybrusk, on the Third Sunday in Lent, March 24th, 1889.

"Be ye therefore followers of God, as dear children; and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling savour."—Ephes. v. 1, 2.

THE Apostle in these words presents to us a summary of Christian duty marked by certain clear and definite characteristics. These characteristics are all the more distinct and impressive when compared with the various systems of ethics or moral philosophy which have influenced mankind in different ages of the world. The philosophy of the ancient Greeks, including that of the Stoics and Epicureans, sought, as its central idea, the attainment of individual happiness. It occupied itself with separate interests; it owned no common brotherhood; each man must bear his own burden, and wear his own dignity. The ancient Indian philosophy, which is the philosophy of the Buddhist to-day, and which our Indian missionaries are continually meeting with, claims a universal brotherhood for humanity. It seeks self-sacrifice as the great end of life. It would bear the burdens of others, in order to bring them to the same self-sacrifice, losing individuality and identity in universal nothingness. In this it differs both from Judaism and Christianity. Judaism in its practice carries out the system of individualism and exclusiveness; but in the Decalogue it gives us a negative list of duties which man is required to observe towards his brother man: "Thou shalt not," etc. In the whole Ten Commandments there is only one positive duty imposed, demanding active service from man to man, viz., "Honour thy father and thy mother," etc. It is here that Christianity transcends all the systems of ethics or moral philosophy which have preceded it. It inculcates not only the negative, but also the positive duties of man to man. It proclaims a universal brotherhood, founded upon the Unity of the Godhead; and that all men are brethren because they are all children of one God, Father, and Creator.

Christianity does not represent the Godhead as a colossal and impassible incarnation of infinite power. But God is presented to us as our heavenly Father, whose very sovereignty is all love. And this God, "Who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son." And this Son of God is none other than Jesus Christ, the divine founder and foundation of our Christian faith. He Himself tells us that "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life." Christianity has its requirements as well as its blessings. Our text brings before us three distinct characteristics—1st, filial obedience; 2nd, enduring love; 3rd, loving self-sacrifice. We must ever remember that as Christians we are God's children; and that God our heavenly Father speaks to us in His written word, and by His Holy Spirit. For the regulation of our life and conduct our heavenly Father has given us His commandments; and the Holy Spirit enlightens our understandings and moves our hearts to know and do the will of God. Our text reminds us of our several duties—

1. Filial obedience.—"Be ye therefore followers (imitators) of God as dear children." God has set us an example to follow, to imitate, in His long suffering, His unspeakable mercy, and in His infinite forgiveness. A man may be able to measure the distances of the stars, compute their magnitudes and revolutions, and tell the wonders of the material universe: but, at the same time, he may lack the childlike spirit of obedience. As little children we must sit at the feet of Jesus as He reveals to us the Father. In our obedience there must be simple faith; the faith of a child, believing faith that would remove mountains. In our obedience there must be a child's love, full of tears and tenderness; unselfish, self-sacrificing, overflowing with kind actions, gentle deeds, and godly emotions. And this, because we are God's dear children, because He has done infinitely more *for us*, in Christ Jesus; and because He desires us to be followers and imitators of Himself. Oh, for the happy, trusting, loving, gentle heart of a child; that we may realise that we are in truth God's dear and obedient children. But if we are God's dear children, let us not wander any longer away from Him; let us return like the Prodigal Son and receive the Father's kiss of love. And what is the Father's love to His children? Language fails to tell. It is "unsearchable," "past finding out," higher than all height, deeper than all depth, and boundless as immensity. Oh! how great and how gracious is the love of God in Christ Jesus our Saviour; how great then should be our loving obedience to Him. Our next duty and characteristic of Christianity is—

2. Enduring love.—"Walk in love as Christ also hath loved us." We are not only taught *why* we should follow God our Saviour even "as dear children," but we are taught the manner *how* to follow Him. It is to be by a constant daily "Walk in love." Forgiveness and love are not to be merely an occasional exercise, but they are to be a daily exercise, a constant habit. This can only be the case when we are filled with love to God. If the love of Christ does not rule in our hearts, it will not become a constant overflow to our brethren, our fellow-men. But if we are God's

"dear children," we must be obedient imitators of Him; we must in some measure love as Christ loved. We know that in Him love reached its highest, grandest, and most glorious conception. He was the incarnate embodiment of Divine love itself. Yet we are called to "Walk in love as Christ also hath loved us."

True Christian love is Godlike; it alone can awaken and develop all that is purest, grandest, and noblest in our human nature. It alone remains enduring, inspiring and sanctifying us to a conformity with Christ. And what did He do for us? O amazing love! He left His throne of glory and the adoration of angels, and stooped down to the manger, the cross, and the grave. Our daily actions, our life-conduct towards our neighbours must flow from an inward, Christ inspired principle of love for their good, for their help and edification. To love as Christ loves there must be a daily and continued outflow of consecrated and holy benevolence. It must be no merely sentimental effervescence of emotional tenderness. It must be a living life-enduring thing; it must be a walking in love. We must become as little chilnren, with happy, pure, kind, and trustful hearts. He whose heart is richest in the love of God will be truest in love to his fellow-men. He who scales the highest mountain summit, beholds in one view the glories of the landscape which surrounds him. The purest and most sanctified love embraces God and man in one glorious whole—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment; and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." These are the upper and the nether pools filled from the same abundant and never-failing fountain. As the rain first descends from the clouds and fills the rivers and the oceans, ere it ascends in vapour, so love first descends from heaven, filling the hearts and souls of men, ere it returns to God and to our fellow-men. It is love flowing forth from God that brings heaven and earth into harmony, brotherhood, and divine fellowship. Therefore being filled with the love of God, let us "Walk in love as Christ hath loved us."

One other characteristic of Christianity is brought before us in our text—

3. Willing self-sacrifice.—"As Christ hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour." Who can comprehend, who can fathom all that is included in these marvellous words, "Christ gave Himself for us." His own wondrous love moved Him to offer Himself a sacrifice to God for us, whilst God so loved us that He gave His Son. Our finite comprehension can never reach the depths of divine love. It surpassed the highest intellects of Cherubim and Seraphim, and men and angels stand lost in wonder and amazement. Created minds can never grasp the fulness of redeeming love—Christ, a loving, willing sacrifice for sinners. It is this self-sacrifice with which Christ imbues His followers, and this is the glorious and peculiar characteristic of Christianity. The Christian who has attained that measure of Christian love, and has made himself, even in a small degree, a sacrifice for others, has also found in that very act a spiritual enrichment of soul, which has more than repaid him all his sacrifice. Thus Christianity does not regard self-sacrifice as the end, the highest end, of his attainment, but as a means for still higher and further spiritual growth and development. And he in whom dwells the highest love and the deepest sympathy with his fellow-men, is he in whom also dwells the truest and purest spirit of self-sacrifice. Christ sought no higher crown, no greater glory than to "Give Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice unto God."

This very principle of loving self-sacrifice, this peculiar characteristic of Christianity, is called by St. Paul "The law of Christ." For when the apostle urges among Christian brethren the exercise of charity and burden-bearing, one for another, he adds, "And so fulfil the law of Christ." Christ being in His own nature most holy and most loving, could be most easily approached by abandoned sinners. Only greatness the highest is able to stoop down to the lowest. And the nearer we approach to Christ in goodness and purity of character, the more intense will be our sympathy with sinners, and the more lovely will be the spirit of self-sacrifice manifested in our daily life.

This is the marvel of Christianity, that the purest being is the being the most tender and forbearing with the impure. He is the one who takes away their sin, pities their abject and lost condition, and in the words of meekness and love says—"Neither do I condemn thee; go, and sin no more." Yet let us remember that the true spirit of self-sacrifice is utterly opposed to the spirit of self-righteousness. Self-righteousness cannot live with the spirit of self-abnegation. The true Christian's estimate of himself will be like that of St. Paul, "I am not worthy to be called an apostle." Yet he will welcome sacrifices; he will glory in tribulation for Christ's sake; he will be ever ready to bear the burden for the weak and for the erring one. His heart will become an altar of sacrifice; and when his path is strewn with thorns and briars, he will walk with bleeding feet murmuring not, because it is the path of duty and the path to God. Fellow Christians, ours is a high and a holy calling. We may have often an aching head and weeping eyes; but this mortal shall yet put on immortality, the glory of the conqueror shall be ours, and heaven shall ring with triumphant hallelujahs as we pass through the gates, and when death is swallowed up in victory.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE,** or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW,** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary. **OBESITY IS CURED,** and will be sent, **gratis and post free,** on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.

(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 27, 1889.

PROGRESS AND POVERTY.

THE *Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register* says that the Episcopal Church "is not the Church of the poor, never has been, and never will be."

Speaking not for the "Episcopal Church" alone, but for the entire Protestant portion of the Catholic Church, under whatever denominational names ranged, we can admit that it is not the Church of the poor in the very especial sense in which the Roman Church is the Church of the poor. The working of the one removes and diminishes poverty, just as the working of the other (the R. C.) maintains and increases it.

The Episcopal Church is not the Church of poverty as a permanency, because the poor under its influences are in the way of ceasing to be the poor.

That which recruits poverty in this country is the constant immigration from Roman Catholic countries. It is a matter of very simple statistics.

Take out the Roman Catholic population and those descended of foreign Romanists, and the question of poverty would be the easiest of economical questions. There would be a very small residuum of poverty caused by idleness and vice which the law could deal with, another small residuum of poverty caused by misfortune which could at once be taken care of, and that would be all.

The Romish Church in this country throws the support of its poor upon the Protestant part of the community.

It keeps the poor in its fold so long as they can pay for the services they receive, and its constant effort is to keep that element of the poor from rising into a state of independence, in which it is liable to throw off the yoke of ecclesiastical control.

The Episcopal, and generally the Protestant Church, will not be the Church of the Poor because the more it controls the poor the faster they rise out of the ranks of poverty. This may or may not be a benefit. We do not enter upon that point, but the fact is a self-evident one in comparing any country under Romish influences with any Protestant country.

A GOOD FRIDAY MEDITATION.

THIS will be too late for the season. But it may not be quite unseasonable. Our Lord's last words supply ample subject for reflection. We need not go back to His sad comment on Judas's act, that it would have been well for him if he had never been born; nor to His warning to St. Peter. Neither need we dwell upon His remonstrance to him who was so ready to die for Him, "What, couldest thou not watch with Me one hour?" But I must pause upon the fact that He who was Divine had His fainting humanity relieved by the ministration of an angel, one of His creatures. We are reminded of what He said before, "Father, save Me from this hour," to which His Deity adds, "but for this cause came I to this hour." We will begin, then, with the coming of the soldiers. He shows His Divine power by striking them backward, and next by restoring the ear which Peter had cut off. Then He submits, mingling the humility of His manhood with the power of His Godhead. We need not follow Him to the different tribunals. He asserts His Godhead whilst He yields to force. Being led away to death, He turns from His own sufferings to the coming ones of those who lamented Him. "Weep not for Me." His Cross being borne after Him, He has now reached the fatal place. Raised aloft, His first prayer is for the cruel soldiers, who, at His feet, were pitilessly dividing His raiment, and casting lots for His vesture. "Father," He cries, "forgive them, for they know not what they do." Seeing His mother and the beloved disciples, He gives them His last directions, as if they stood around a peaceful dying bed. "Woman, behold thy son," and "Behold thy mother." All earthly cares being thus dismissed, He hears the prayer of the thief at His side, who, amidst the shame and agony, can see the crucified One coming in His kingdom, and has faith to hope for a part in it. To him addressed the words, as from a king on his throne: "To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise." Next comes the cry of suffering humanity, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" which the mocking hearers took up, as further ground for insult. Next follow the words, "I thirst," that the Scriptures

might be fulfilled. We now close—"Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit"; and, "It is finished." At this crash the sun clouded his face, the Temple tore its veil, and the earth her garments. The tombs were opened, and the dead came forth to herald His resurrection. Even in His rising again we have the humanity mingled with the Divinity. An angel shall roll away the stone, though the Deity Himself restored Himself to life. Vain man will not allow this fact, but he may confound the humanity and Deity together. The body must pass through the rock, as though, if it did, that would necessarily enable it to be in a hundred places at once. Our senses are made powerless, so that neither the Apostles nor we are left with any certain proof that the same body died that lived and taught, and suffered before the Apostles' eyes.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE BOOK OF JONAH.

SIR,—Mr. Crosthwaite says that I give no answer to the question, How can we know when Scripture records history, when mere myths? I give no answer to the question, for one reason because it is of the same kind as "Answer yes or no; are you a Christian or a Mahometan?" Every book or every tradition is not of necessity either a history or a myth.

The matter under discussion is, Is the book of Jonah historical or allegorical? or both? or what is it? I ask for reason for thinking that it is a history, and receive none from your correspondent. The inference which I cannot but make is, that he has no reason to give, and has no knowledge of criticism upon which to base an opinion. I beg pardon, he does say that our Lord refers to Jonah as history. He thinks our Lord does so, because in the same connection He speaks of Solomon, who was a real person. According to this, anyone who refers say to Lord George Sackville and Bob Acres as examples of cowardice implies that both of them were real persons.

I do not say that Mr. Crosthwaite plays into the hands of infidels. I say that he makes use of infidel argument. Unwarned, he repeats it. "An infidel may well say that our Lord's death, resurrection, &c., ... are . . . . fabulous." That is, an infidel may well say that the foundation of the Christian religion is fabulous, although the evidence is overwhelming, because some people think Jonah an allegory, a matter on which there is hardly any evidence at all. If this were not preposterous it would be shocking.

Jonah is a book, the origin of which is unknown. The origin of nearly all the books of the Bible is a matter on which we have a very large amount of knowledge.

If anyone has said that we are not to judge the Old Testament by anything in the New, it is not I who said so. "If inspired, their authority (*i.e.*, the various Holy Scriptures) is equal." This is contrary to the witness of the Scriptures themselves, which speak of different kinds and measures of inspiration (Heb. i. 1; John iii. 34), &c. Even were there no express statements of the kind in the Bible, the assumption is without warrant.

I asked for no test between history and parables. The answer that Mr. Crosthwaite gives to the question he attributes is no answer at all, because it assumes that the judgment of all reasonable men must be the same as his. I ask for some reason for thinking Jonah as history, and have received none.

Perhaps I should not have applied for instruction to a writer who employs infidel arguments to enforce his views.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

20th April, 1889.

SIR,—As you have not yet closed the controversy on this subject, perhaps you would kindly permit me to make a few remarks on it.

That it is a real history has been the prevailing belief both among Jews and Christians for a very long time; but lately an attempt has been made to introduce the notion that it is an apologue. When we are asked to give up a belief so long established, we have a right to expect that we shall be furnished with indubitable evidence of the truth of the new theory as a valid reason for so important a change in our sentiments. I have, therefore, read with some care the letters of your correspondents, in order to try and find out the grounds on which we are expected to make this change, and, as I anticipated, they are highly unsatisfactory.

1. The first principle postulated on behalf of the apologue is that "the mode of presentation of the truth is of no independent value." If this be so, then why contend so strongly for the book being an apologue? Would it not answer its purpose equally well to be regarded as history? This admission, though intended to prepare the way for the reception of the new theory, is but a confession of its weakness, and a clear proof that confidence in it had taken but slight hold on the minds of its advocates. But it is not true. A real story and a fictitious one make different impressions on the mind. To tell a story of events that might really occur, and to give no intimation that it is a fiction, is to leave the impression on the mind that it is real. And this is nothing but telling a lie. We are forbidden to think that inspiration would teach men such a fraud. Accordingly, care is taken in the Bible to let us know what kind of teaching we are going to receive.

This is peculiarly noticeable in the prophets, where each author introduces his work to public notice by the "Word of the Lord came," or words of the same import. And so we read the "Word of the Lord came to *Jonah*, the son of Amittai." This book must, therefore, stand or fall with the other prophetic books.

2. A good way to judge of its being an apologue is to compare it with a story admittedly such. And, notably, there is Jotham's, about "the trees going forth on a time to anoint a king over them;" wherein we see inanimate things invested with human attributes, performing human actions, and speaking human words. And this unnatural conjunction of attributes leaves no doubt on the mind that the story is a fable. But there is nothing at all like this in the Book of Jonah, where all is natural, suitable, and rational.

In order to perceive this, we must remember that Jehovah is the principal personage in the scene, and that it was according to His nature to send a prophet to warn a guilty city of impending doom; natural for

the storm to arise, and the gourd to grow at His command; natural for the fish to swallow and vomit up Jonah at His bidding; natural for people to repent under an awful threatening. All is natural and real, and there is not the slightest hint given in the whole book that we should take these things in any other sense. Where, then, does the fable come in? It is no fable to represent nature as obedient to her Omnipotent Lord, nor that man is unwilling to obey his Maker's commands, nor that repentance is a mental operation, nor that gratitude for deliverance from danger is a gracious feeling of the heart.

3. An apologue to be effective in teaching power must be *drawn* from, or *founded* upon, real actions and relationships; upon things credible, natural, and likely to occur; or upon usages well known and easily understood; and for an author to found his apologue upon unnatural and incredible things would be to render its teaching nugatory, and to leave himself open to the charge of the want of common sense. Thus, for instance, if the people to whom Jotham delivered his apologue had never heard of such a thing, or if such a thing had never been in existence, as people electing a king over themselves, his fable would have fallen upon their ears like sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal, and they would have laughed at both him and it. And so, if any one were to say that it is an incredible thing for people to repent at the preaching of a prophet, and then to represent this same thing as occurring in an apologue, is to make the lesson drawn from that apologue incredible also. And yet this is the very thing that is done in the present case. Men tell us that the repentance of the Ninevites is incredible, that the miracles are grotesque, and that Jonah is irrational; and all this without perceiving that they caricature their apologue in the same way. And yet, we are informed, the book is no less inspired on this account! Inspiration teaching the incredible, grotesque, and irrational! How shocking! On the showing of its own advocates, therefore, this apologue theory is little short of plain blasphemy.

4. The didactic principle contained in an apologue is generally considered to be in existence prior to the rise of the circumstances to which it is intended to apply it. I mean to say that apologues are intended to be guides for the future, not for the past. There would be little use in teaching a man by an apologue what he had already learned by experience. That would be asking him to be wise after the event. And this is more especially to be observed when the apologue is said to be of a typical nature. The type always precedes the antitype; and it would be a strange method of teaching to put the antitype before the type. But this is precisely what is done in the present case. Jonah, we are told, was a typical representation of the disobedience, captivity, and restoration of Israel, Jehovah's servant; but, being a post-exilian production, it makes the type come after the antitype.

5. We are further told that we ought not to be prejudiced by theological inferences from our Lord's references to the subject in Matt. xii. 40, which means that we ought not to accept the truth at His hands for fear that the apologue theory would thereby be proved untrue. Though "He spake as never man spake," yet it is asserted that the outward form of even *His* teaching was conditioned by the religious beliefs of His countrymen. A person recoils with disgust from the profanity in these sentiments. But what better could we expect from one who could say that Joppa was a town unknown in the Old Testament before the Captivity; whereas it is mentioned in Joshua xix. 46 and 2 Chron. ii. 16. Equal in value to this statement are the assertions about Job and Michael, and many other things in those letters.

R. DONALDSON.

April 15, 1889.

BURIAL AND CREMATION.

SIR,—In view of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Church of England Burial, Funeral, and Mourning Reform Association, to be held on Friday, May 3rd, at 3 p.m., in the Mansion House, London, kindly permit me to urge that the only satisfactory solution of the difficulties which beset the disposal of the dead lies in the inculcation of the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection, as it is enforced in the Apostolic utterance:—"It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body," and illustrated in the words—"the glory of the celestial is one, the glory of the terrestrial is another." The Christian doctrine of the Resurrection implies a real continuity between the earthly body and the risen body, the nature of which is not revealed, but not a resuscitation of the material particles of which the corruptible body is composed, and which are destined to shew forth the glory of God by building up new organizations. Our obvious duty is to observe natural law, and so to dispose of human remains as to enable them to perform the functions assigned to them; but this is just what we have not done. A prevalent mis-belief has ignored S. Paul's words:—"We sow not that body that shall be," and a desire has in consequence arisen to preserve the dead body; hence durable coffins, imperishable coffins, triple coffins; hence also bricked graves, and under-ground cells of corruption; hence, further, the perversion of thought, which cannot get away from the bondage of the flesh; and hence, finally, the petrifaction of the spiritual life by associations connected with graves. It is this unnatural mode of burial, with the consequent peril to the public health, which has created a demand for an artificial mode of disposing of the dead by means of fire. The Burial Reform Association, which has nothing whatever to do with any other mode than that of burial, seek to bring back the nation to the natural "earth to earth" mode ordered in the Burial Service, and asks for prompt moral and practical support.

F. LAWRENCE,

Hon. Sec. Church of England Burial, Funeral, and Mourning Reform Association.

Westow Vicarage, York.

April 23rd, 1889.

MR. DIXON'S SERMON.

SIR,—One of your correspondents somewhat facetiously takes exception to the assertion in my sermon of the 6th that "the Almighty never allows the wills or machinations of men or devils to clash with His divine purposes." It will be remembered I was endeavouring to show that, although evil seems apparently to succeed, good must ultimately triumph; that

the wicked can go no farther and work no more mischief than the Almighty permits.

In this connection the assertion seems to me a Christian truism, the denial of it a logical absurdity. God's purposes—which have been well defined as the decision or determination of His will—have been matured from all eternity. He never alters His plans to meet contingencies, for with God there are no contingencies. Moreover, He is omnipotent. Therefore, for the purposes of the creature to frustrate the purposes of the Creator, is inconceivable.

Permit me, Sir, to illustrate the point by the reference in my sermon to the Egyptian bondage. At a definite point or period of time—neither sooner nor later—God purposed to deliver His people. Did He allow the *fiat* of Pharaoh—"I will not let them go"—to frustrate that purpose, or even retard it for one moment? We are specially contemplating this week our Saviour's Passion. The malice of the Pharisees and clamour of the multitude, combined with the weak, wicked, wavering mind of Pilate, resulted in the Crucifixion of Christ. These men, in carrying out their wicked purposes, were free agents. Did their purposes, I ask Mr. Walker, clash with the purposes of the Almighty? Nay, we know, on the contrary, the purposes of the Almighty, long before predicted, were thus fulfilled. The will or purpose of Sennacherib, with his mighty host, would fain have crossed or clashed with the divine purpose. What was the result? "God's purpose ground the purposes of His enemies to powder, and poured contempt on all their plans. Human planning and purposing invariably comes to nothing when God wills that it should. The planning may be intricate, the purposing firm; but the intricacy and firmness are as if they were non-existent to God." In short, wherever and whenever God and man are at cross purposes, the clashing is infinitely less effective on the part of man than the clashing of a mouse with an express train.

Does Mr. Walker seriously set himself to refute this argument? Does he seriously mean to reverse the well-known proverb, and contend that "God proposes and man disposes"? In asking him this question I am not unmindful, as he seems to suppose, of the existence and "the mystery of iniquity," or of the profound problem of man's free will and God's foreknowledge.

I have just laid my hands on a volume which contains a passage so strikingly *apropos* of the argument that I cannot forbear giving some extracts. The italics are my own:—

"It does not admit of denial or doubt that the wicked meet with a large measure of success in this world. If God were to doom them to an unbroken series of disappointments and defeats, they would not be the only sufferers, and they would have cause to complain that, though numbering freedom among their gifts, there was no sphere for its exercise. . . ." But "it were a serious mistake to suppose they can do what and as they please, or that they are allowed, even the most favourably situated, to work their wicked wills." . . . "God has absolute power over them. He has so arranged and so administers affairs, that we may describe them as *circum-hedged*. He has complete control over them, and He can check them when and where and as it suits Him." "The wicked do not use the phrase, "If the Lord will"; but they should use it. "It depends ultimately on God," etc. . . . "What avails the 'I shall' of the wicked against God's 'Thou shalt not'? Nothing at all, as the history of nations has again and again shown." . . . "When their purposes *clash* with the purposes of God, *the clashing proves fatal to their purposes*. . . ." "If omnipotence were resistable it were misnamed omnipotence. Neither singly nor collectively can creatures carry anything against the Divine Will or power."

I particularly draw Mr. Walker's attention to the following passage. It contains the gist of the whole matter, embodies my own assertion, and stands or falls with mine. If the argument in it be fallacious, will Mr. Walker point out where the fallacy lies?

"It is bad purposes of which God disapproves, and in proportion to their inherent badness; but the badness of a purpose, let it be distinctly noted, *is no proof that it clashes with the purposes of God*. If it were, it would follow that not one bad purpose formed by man had ever been or could be executed; but what is the fact? Countless millions of bad purposes have been carried out," etc. . . . "A young man, let us suppose, makes up his mind to rob his employer, and it is not long till the sinful purpose is put into execution. Query—What was God's relation to the purpose? Was there a counter purpose in His mind—*a purpose with which it clashed?* Evidently not, for if there had been, the act of robbery would not have taken place. With the utmost ease God could have deprived him of the opportunity and the power to rob his employer. What God purposed was that, while disapproving of the purpose to rob, He would permit the execution of it, or not interfere by the exercise of His omnipotence to hinder its execution. If matters had stood thus; if, on the one side, there had been the purpose to rob, and on the other side there had been the purpose to prevent robbery, that would have been a clear case of the clashing of purposes; and which purpose would have taken effect? There can be but one answer — the Divine purpose would have triumphed."

I hope Mr. Walker will confine himself to the argument: our respective powers of "sagacity" may be very well left to the readers of the PULPIT.

RICHARD DIXON.

London.

WE are asked to state that the committee of the Barbican Mission to the Jews, make an earnest appeal for funds for carrying on the active agencies of this mission among God's ancient people. Contributions may be sent to the Rev. Prebendary Gordon Calthrop, President; Alfred Hughes, Esq., Treasurer, Ferncliffe, Queen Elizabeth's Avenue, Stoke Newington, N., or the Secretary, Rev. E. A. Wesley, M.A., A.K.C., Mountgrove House, Overhill Road, Forest Hill, S.E.

ON the 17th inst., the new rector of Spitalfields, the Rev. J. H. Scott, invited all his Jewish parishioners to a service in the parish church for Jews only, conducted entirely in Hebrew German. The service was held at 4.30 p.m. It was the second day of Passover, and no fewer than 300 Jews accepted the invitation. The service consisted of a few prayers and two lessons, both suitable to the occasion, and read respectively by one of the curates and the Rev. J. M. Eppstein, and interspersed with well-known hymns. The sermon was preached by the Rev. C. N. Nagel. No signs of hostility were shown, and the Jews present observed the best possible order.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baker, Rev. Arthur, Chaplain to the *Urgent*.
Bartram, Rev. Harry, Vicar of Ramsgate ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Kent.
Bean, Rev. B. N., Vicar of Bubbington ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Warwickshire.
Bishop, Rev. F. W., Fremantle, Vicar of All Saint's, Winterbourne Down.
Botham, Rev. G. W., Rector of Whittington, Chesterfield ; Rector of Anderby-cum-Cumberworth, Lincolnshire.
Braithwaite, Rev. P. N. Pipon, Vicar of St. Luke's, Jersey ; Vicar of Andover.
Challis, Rev. J. L., Vicar of Stone, Bucks ; Rural Dean of Aylesbury.
Connell, Rev. Robert, B.D., Vicar of Skelmersdale, near Ormskirk.
Cotton, Rev. J. L., Vicar of Aston-Rowant, Tetsworth ; Vicar of Kidmore, Reading.
Dunne, Rev. G. T., Vicar of St. John's, Barrow-in-Furness ; English Chaplain at Riga.
Egremont, Rev. H. E., of St. Columbia's Mission, Eastney ; Rector of Emsworth, Hants.
Ellis, Rev. H. Venn, Curate of Purleigh ; Vicar of Stowmarket, Suffolk.
Eyre, Rev. P. D., Rector of Newham, Hampshire.
Fearon, Rev. Dr., Head Master of Winchester College ; Honorary Canon of Winchester Cathedral.
Fenton, Rev. T. J. O'Connor, Curate of St. Peter's, Birkenhead; Curate-in-Charge of the New Conventional District in the Parish of Kirby.
Gill, Rev. A., Vicar of Harbertonford ; Rector of Farringdon, Exeter.
Gordon, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of St. Stephen's, Hulme, Manchester.
Haines, Rev. F. W., Chaplain and Form Master at Sunningdale School, Berks.
Hamilton, Rev. Charles Gillingham, M.A., Chaplain of the Manchester Royal Lunatic Hospital at Cheadle.
Hoare, Rev. John Gurney, M.A., Rural Dean for the South of Ingworth, Norfolk.
Hopgood, Rev. J. P. Davey, Vicar of Orcop, Hereford.
Humble, Rev. Emersom, Rector of St. Stephen's, Hulme ; Rector of Paddock, Huddersfield.
Hunt, Rev. J. B., Curate-in-Charge of St. John's, Barrow-in-Furness.
Jones, Rev. E. A., Rector of Cavenham, Suffolk.
Jones, Rev. Enoch, Rector of Llansannan, Denbigshire.
Jones, Rev. Samuel, Vicar of Llangunnor ; Rural Dean of Carmarthen.
Jones, Rev. Thomas Thorpe Lee, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
Kewley, Rev. James, William, Rector of Matlock, Derbyshire ; Surrogate.
M'Lean, Rev. T. B., Rector of Danby-Whiske, Northallerton.
Mangin, Rev. Samuel Wareing, Perpetual Curate of West Knowle, Wilts.
Markham, Rev. Charles W., Rector of Aughton ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Westmoreland.
Mason, Rev. H. J., Curate of Eastleigh, Hants ; Vicar of Great Wigston, near Leicester.
Morgan, Rev. D. Watcyn, B.A., Curate of St. John's, Morristown ; Vicar of Llangyfelach, Glamorganshire.
Munroe, Rev. Martin Shipham, Vicar of John's, Little Hulton, Bolton ; Acting Chaplain to the 1st Battalion of the Manchester Regiment.
Newman, Rev. William James Hermann, M.A., Vicar of Steeple Barton, Oxon.
Nickerson, Rev. David, Chaplain to the Forces at Manchester.
Orr, Rev. Robert, Curate of New Shoreham ; Rector of St. Thomas-at-Cliffe, Lewes, Sussex.
Pearce, Rev. W. P., Rector of Ayott, St. Lawrence, near Welwyn, Herts.
Pennington, Rev. Thomas Richard, B.A., Curate of St. Mark's, Oldham ; Rector of St. Mark's, Hulme.
Price, Rev. James, Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Pritchard, Rev. T., Curate of Penmaenmawr ; Rector of Cemmaes, Anglesey.
Roderick, Rev. E. M., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Llanfihangel-Aberbythich ; Private Secretary and Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Asaph.
Rogers, Rev. S., Vicar of St. Mark's, Liverpool ; Incumbent of Laura Chapel, Bath.
Ruhje, Rev. George, Vicar of Witherslack, near Grange-over-Sands, Lancashire ; Vicar of Cartmel.
Rundle, Rev. S., M.A., Vicar of Goldolphin, Cornwall ; Rural Dean of Kirrier.
Sanders, Rev. Charles Lepage, Vicar of Charlton All Saints', Salisbury ; Chaplain to Earl Nelson.
Scott, Rev. Alexander, Vicar of Pateley Bridge ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Yorkshire.
Scott, Rev. William John, B.A., Minister of the District of St. Saviour's, Upper Sunbury.
Sewell, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Master of the Preparatory School, Weymouth College ; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Shelford, Rev. L. E., Rector of Stoke Newington ; Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral.
Skelding, Rev. W. S. P., M.A., Curate of Bowdon ; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Hoylake, Cheshire.
Spicer, Rev. Newton J., Rector of East Woodhay ; Rural Dean of Andover, N.
Trotman, Rev. E. F., Vicar of Marshfield ; Vicar of St. James's, Gloucester.
Upcher, Rev. Arthur Hamilton, M.A., Rural Dean for the North Division of Ingworth, Norfolk.
Vignoles, Rev. O. J., Assistant-Minister of St. Peter's, Vere Street, Oxford Street.
Walker, Rev. C. L., Vicar of Fingringhoe, Essex.
Wane, Rev. J. B., B.A., Curate of Ewell, Surrey ; Vicar of St. John's, Lowestoft.
Ward, Rev. C. B., Rural Dean of Glossop.
Whistler, Rev. Thomas Webster, B.A., Vicar of Hempstead, Norfolk.
William-Blyth, Rev. Philip, Rector of Rockland St. Mary.
Wilton, Rev. Richard, M.A., Rector of Londesborough, Yorkshire.
Wimberley, Rev. Charles Irvine, M.A., Rector of East Chinnock.
Wyatt, Rev. Paul W., Curate of St. James's, Piccadilly ; Vicar of St. Leonard's, Bedford.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Anderson, Rev. Robert G., M.A., formerly Vicar of Monton, Rutland, and Walcot, Lincs., at Bath, on the 20th inst., aged 58.
Carwithen, Rev. George Edmund, at Stoke, Devonport, on Easter Day, aged 65.
Christie, Rev. Edward Richard, M.A., late Head Master of Magdalen College School, Oxford, at Wandsworth, on the 19th inst., aged 30.
Cobbe, Rev. William Power, M.A., at 102, Rouge Bouillon, St. Helier's, Jersey, on the 18th inst.
Hope-Edwards, Rev. Leighton, of Netley, on the 16th inst., aged 46.
Hussey, Rev. Edward, at Hastings, on Easter Day, aged 32.
Lee, Rev. James Percy, B.A., Assistant-Curate of Alfreton Parish Church, at Alfreton, Derbyshire, on the 17th inst.
Moore, Rev. J. Cecil Hamilton, sometime Curate of St. Matthew, Clapton, at 81, Wellington Road, Dublin, on the 13th inst.
Moore, Rev. Edward, M.A., Ch. Ch., Oxford, Honorary Canon of Canterbury Cathedral, on the 20th inst.
Norris, Rev. William Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Floore, and formerly Rector of Oaksey, Wilts, at 3, Sackville Terrace, Halifax, on the 16th inst., aged 58.
Philpot, Rev. William Benjamin, M.A., at South Bersted Vicarage, on the 16th inst., aged 65.
Smith, Rev. William Robins, for fifteen years Rector of Monnington-on-Wye, Herefordshire, in London, on the 14th inst. (Palm Sunday), aged 58.
Vaughan, Rev. Matthew, for twenty-five years Vicar of the parish, at Finchingfield Vicarage, on the 16th inst., aged 66.
Wilkinson, Rev. Charles Allix, M.A., Rector of Boxworth, previous Rector of South Willingham, formerly Domestic Chaplain to their Majesties Ernest and George, Kings of Hanover, on the 18th inst., aged 75.
Woolcombe, Rev. Louis, M.A., formerly Rector of Petrockstowe, North Devon, and lately Vicar of Menheniot, Cornwall, at Talland, Newton Abbot, on the 19th inst., aged 75.

The Church of England Pulpit.

FUNERAL REFORM.

By the Rev. H. N. GRIMLEY, M.A., Rector of Norton, Bury St. Edmund's.

Sermon Preached in the Church of S. Edmund the King, Lombard Street, London, on Friday, May 3, 1889, before the Members of the Church of England Funeral Reform Association.

"There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another. . . . . There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body."—1 Cor. xv. 40, 44.

THERE are bodies celestial, and bodies terrestrial. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. There is a celestial realm, and there is a terrestrial realm. There is a realm of the spiritual, and a realm of the material. There is a spiritual world, and there is a material world. Man is a dweller in both worlds. He lives in communion with both. In the human body the celestial and the terrestrial meet; the spiritual and the material are in union. As to his outward frame man is an integral part of the universe of matter. That which gives endurance to rocks and mountains enters into the frame of man to give it strength and solidity. Whatsoever gives beauty of form and colour to trees and flowers lends its aid to impart touches of attractiveness and comeliness to the human body. The earth is our nourishing mother. Her enveloping atmosphere is for us the breath of life. Her fertility yields to us the corn, and wine, and oil, with which we renew our strength, are made sharers in her gladness, and secure for our bodies pliancy and lissomness. In many ways are we sharers in a common life with the material world. The storms that sweep over land and sea send their premonitory pulsings through our frames. When sunshine fills the air with genial warmth man enters into nature's rejoicing mood. With the world of nature we are all as to our bodies in oneness and fellowship. We are at one with that world, and are partakers of its glory.

But there is a world other than the natural world. There is the spiritual world above us, around us, and within us. This is the world underlying the visible one, and yet having that in its embrace and control. This is the world, the glory of which gleams through all material things for recognition by the reverent human soul. This is the world in which thought and affection, beauty, and tenderness, and grace are the great realities. This is the world within the confines of which man holds deepest communion with man—communion in truth and love. And as he by his material body has relations of oneness with the visible world, so he by means of his spiritual body is allied in oneness with the spiritual world. It is within that world that man enters into communion with the Lord of the human soul—with the Divine Spirit from whom his own spirit is derived. Man then in his threefold nature—body, soul, and spirit—dwells, when his life attains to its truest harmony, in relations of oneness with the natural world, with the spiritual world, and with the Divine controlling Spirit. His material body is at one with the material universe. His spiritual body or soul is in oneness with the spiritual universe. His spirit, that which is the breath of life for his soul, and through that controls and puts its impress upon the material body, is that which in our thoughts we must associate with the Divine Spirit of Him who is Lord and Father of us all. Man's salvation, in body, soul, and spirit, consists in this life in a threefold harmony. The health or salvation of his outward frame consists largely in his dwelling in orderly relations with the outer world. The health of his soul is maintained by his abiding in harmonious relations with the spiritual world, considered as the world of human souls—the world embracing the souls of the whole brotherhood and sisterhood of humanity. And that aspect of the life of salvation which transcends and yet includes all others, is the one which is present to our thoughts when we say that man is spiritually reconciled to or at one with God.

These thoughts as to our right relations to our material surroundings, to our spiritual environment, and to the One Divine Spirit, the Creator and Sustainer of all things visible and invisible, must be vividly before our minds when we contemplate the subject of the death of the material body. There comes for us all—there is coming for you and for me—an hour when these bodies of ours will separate themselves from our souls, will, as it were, fall away from them. Our souls find themselves at once in the spiritual world. They begin at once a new life in that world. True it is that they have all along hitherto lived in that world, though it has been partly veiled from them by material appearances. But that which partly veils the spiritual world from dwellers in this world also partly reveals it to them. Invisible things have ever had visible things for their counterparts and correspondences. The more reverently and enquiringly we have lived in the world of material appearances the more shall we be prepared to discern the spiritual realities corresponding to them, when our new life begins in the world now unseen by us. But when that new life begins, are we right in saying that there is a cessation of the threefold existence in man, of body, soul, and spirit? The answer to this must

be expressed with great care. Our bodies slip away from us, it is true, into the embrace of mother earth. There is for us the beginning of a new life in the spiritual world. With that world we are now able to recognise more clearly our oneness. For the faithful soul, whose life has been already one of union with Christ, there is also an ascension into closer spiritual union with the Divine Spirit. Soul and spirit thus enter into more fulness of union with the world of souls and with the Lord of the soul. But what are henceforth the relations of the soul with the material body? Have we to think of any severance at all between the spiritual world and the material world? Will not, when we pass away from the sight of those who will remain in this world, the spiritual world still continue to embrace and interpenetrate and pour its rich floods of life into the material world? Will there not be still in the higher world the promise and potency of every form of life which will go on manifesting its wondrous cycle of change to those who will still dwell on earth? The spiritual world will never loose its embrace of the material world; will ever encircle it with life-giving ministrations. The divinely-sustained union of spiritual things with natural will still continue. We who will have entered into the fulness of the life of the spiritual world will have become sharers in the supremacy of that world over the material world. The divinely-ordered relations between the worlds spiritual and material we shall have become partakers in. By virtue of our having become an integral part of the spiritual world, the material world becomes beneficently subject unto us. We have become sharers in the triumph of the Son of Man, of whom heaven is the throne and earth is the footstool. If we have not been able to take with us our material flesh and blood to inherit with us the kingdom of heaven, we have entered upon, in our new spiritual existence, a fuller inheritance than ever was possible to us before of the kingdom of earth.

Incidentally, I may mention that should it ever by divine ordinance be possible for us to dwell again upon earth, we should be clothed upon again with material particles, which would have impressed upon them from the controlling spirit within all the signs and expressions which would render the outward in harmony with the inward, and identify us with what we are now in this present life. But recognition of this possibility does not lessen our assurance that there is awaiting us a prolonged, and may we not say an endless, existence in the spiritual world.

What is essential for us to see clearly is this—that when there has been realised by us all that is involved in the solemn words we each so constantly recite, "I believe in the resurrection of the body"—when we are clothed upon with glorified bodies, presenting to those in sympathy with us aspects corresponding to and marking their identity with the very bodies which were ours when they knew and loved us on earth—when of our bodies it may be said that they are sharers of the glory of the Lord's Resurrection Body—the chief thing that we shall be conscious of is, that we shall be spiritual beings dwelling within the spiritual world, with the glory of the celestial and the glory of the terrestrial alike unfolded to our view. In the life that now is we have to strive to be possessed of the like consciousness, but it becomes ours only in part. In fulness of time, however, in the life that is to come, we shall enter upon this consciousness with increasing perfectness. What we now discern only in part will then be revealed to us with exceeding glory.

We are wont to look upon our Lord's resurrection as foreshadowing our own. We are right in so doing, and we are right in thinking of the glory of His Resurrection Body as having to be shared in by ourselves. His mysterious appearances and disappearances—the fact that He was seen only by those who had known and loved Him, and that even by them He was not always at once recognised, not seen by them to be the Lord until there had been kindled within them what we may speak of as a spiritual discernment—the fact, too, that His appearances were only few in number—all point to this, that our Lord during the great forty days was dwelling alike in the spiritual world and in the material world. The glories and splendours of both worlds were present to His view. His glorified body was dwelling in subjection to spiritual laws. He could mysteriously appear in the room in which the disciples were gathered together, though the door opened not to admit Him. When He was fully recognised by the two disciples at Emmaus, known to them in the solemn breaking of bread, He then vanished mysteriously from their sight. It was not granted to them to see through the veil behind which He had retired into the spiritual world. And yet to Him the scenes of earth would be still unfolded, as well as the wonders of the spiritual world. A reverent pondering on our part on our Lord's resurrection experiences are essential to our having a right discernment of what will be our own.

But this is a digression—though an important one—from the main line of thought as to the subject which is immediately before us. To proceed. If such partaking in the supremacy of the spiritual world, as I have spoken of, be part of the divine ordering of our future life, what must be said as to our bodies that we leave behind us in this world? Bear in mind, however, that the nearness of the spiritual world to this one when realised by us ought to induce us to refrain from saying that we shall ever be separated from, ever leave behind us in any true sense, material things. But what must be said as to these bodies of ours from which life has departed? We say that they are

dead. We reverently bury them out of sight. We entrust them to the embrace of mother earth. As, however, we begin to consider how best divine order may be conformed to in our arrangements for their burial in the ground, let us pause to take note how words in which S. Paul speaks in another sense of dying daily are applicable to our bodies at all times. They are ever in this life dying daily. From beginning to end of life the material particles of our bodies are only with us for a while. We are continually assimilating new particles; we are continually throwing off from us those that have rendered us beneficent service. At every time we give forth our breath particles of our frame proceed from us to mingle with the air around us, to enter into combination with other particles, to be absorbed into other living organisms, to establish in countless ways a communion between ourselves and the material world. The particles which at this moment make up this hand that I hold up before you are only making a transit through this form of mine from the world outside me to that world again. They come; they go; but between their coming and going they become sharers in the life of my body. They partake of the agitations and movements, with the help of which this hand exercises its cunning. And so also as I move in the outer world, I know that everywhere around me there are atoms that once shared in the tremours of my brain, that once formed part of the wondrous structure of these eyes of mine which enable the vision of things around me to be present within me, that once formed part of the organ by which the harmonies of sound are brought to me to dwell henceforth in the mysterious chamber of my memory. Recognising how atoms that once helped up the symmetry of these bodies of ours, and shared in the pulsings and throbbings which accompany the ceaseless emotions of our life, are now associated with things around us, how can we be other than vividly conscious of our oneness with the world of nature? Saintly souls, with a clearness of insight which enable them to discern results which we are wont to think of as only unfolding themselves to enlightened enquirers within the divine realm of science, have recognised, with even a fervour of delight, a mystic communion between themselves and the whole created world. Did not S. Francis, nearly 700 years ago, sing in sweet and simple strains of his brotherhood with all creatures? Did he not speak of his brother the Sun, of sister Moon, of brother Wind, of sister Water, of mother Earth? Did he not hear how they all, with the fruit, flowers, and herbs springing up around him, were ever raising a chorus of praise to the Lord of all? And may we not find our own discernment of hidden bonds of communion with nature quickened and intensified by our recognition of something of ourselves in all around us? May not the thought present itself to us that when we hear the singing of birds, self-same atoms are quivering in rhythmic sequence which once made tuneful the voices of our friends, that when we look upon flowers we may see in their delicate structures particles which once were in the grasp of our own vitality, and are now transformed so as to enter upon another order of usefulness in the realm of nature—that realm on which all things have a divinely-ordered kinship with ourselves?

When we reach the close of our allotted time in this world, there will be—more especially if length of days has been ours—diffused throughout the material world countless atoms which once were associated with ourselves, which once were swayed by the full energy of our own life. The thoughts that I have brought before you will point out to you how as long as the spiritual life within us manifests its energies by means of our bodily organism, so long shall we be sharers alike in the glory of the celestial and in the glory of the terrestrial. But when our bodies slip from us, when the spiritual world reveals itself to us as our future home, it is necessary that the arrangements made by common consent of the living for the seclusion of our lifeless bodies shall be so in accord with the divine order of things that there shall be no interference with the manifestation of the glory of the terrestrial. By an almost universal accord, throughout Christendom, the bodies of those for whom the spiritual world has become the scene of their future activities have been consigned by burial to the embrace of mother earth. With us the voice of the Church utters reverently over the form that lies in a new-made grave, "Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust." Some there are who advocate, and who have already begun to carry out what they advocate, when death enters their family circle, the custom of burning the bodies of the dead. Burning is, however, but rapid decomposition—the rapid sundering of particle from particle, atom from atom, followed instantly by the rapid union of atoms previously apart to form new substances initially for the most part in etherial forms. But what is thus rapidly accomplished by special costly arrangements nature has her own method of bringing about slowly. Nature has her own burning process. She gently enwreathes all lifeless bodies entrusted to her care with a flame of slowly consuming fire. But the bodies must be trustfully committed to her care. Mother earth must close around them without any hindrances thoughtlessly devised by ourselves. There must be no solidly constructed vaults. There must be no bricked graves. There must be no coffins of impervious metal. If coffins be made even of wood, we should not select that which is most solid and durable. The coffin should be of the lightest construction, so that there may be as little check as possible to the beneficent action of the surrounding earth upon the lifeless form. In this, as in all other matters entrusted to our control, it is possible for divine order to be violated. If

there is such violation, how can there be a manifestation of the glory of the terrestrial? If from a futile desire to arrest the process of the body's disintegration we put between it and the surrounding earth a too substantial barrier, the time at last comes when the pent-up gases which have been generated burst through the imprisoning walls around them into the porous soil. The churchyard earth becomes overcharged with gaseous compounds which are not where they should be, and which are hurtful to the lives of those who dwell hard by. If nature's exceeding slowness had been trusted to, and if no barrier of excessive durability had been placed around the lifeless body, the air that permeates the porous earth would ere long have had access to the remains, and its oxygen would have united to atoms set free, and the etherial product of the union would have slowly distributed itself through the upper soil, there to contribute to the vitality and growth of plants and trees. Divine order thus allowed free course would have led to the manifestation of the glory of the terrestrial in trees and their foliage, in grassy swards, in leaf and flower, in blossom and fruit. But if there be a violation of divine order, think of the disastrous results that follow. Our mother earth is intended to contain for us in her hidden recesses reservoirs of life-giving water. But to be life-giving the water must be pure, untainted. How can it be such if there are hurtful gases saturating the soil? How can we say of water springing up near our churchyards S. Francis's words:

> Thy praise, my Lord, be sung by sister water
> Who is most useful, humble, precious, chaste,

if by our own faulty arrangements we have hindered the working of orderly processes? Every well from which water is drawn for the refreshment and service of the Lord's children should be a holy well. If there be wells near our churchyards they too should be holy wells. But how can they be if their purity is destroyed, if their wholeness is invaded by hurtful gases? Again, too, the air to be breathed by the Lord's children to maintain the life of their bodies should have its correspondence with that divine influence which is the sustaining breath of the higher life of our souls kept inviolate. But if we have to breathe impure air, how can we discern any connection between that air and the Holy Spirit which has access to our souls to inbreathe into them pure thoughts and sweet affections? If, while we dwell on earth our actions are to help on the manifestation of the glory of the terrestrial, we must be obedient to influences in harmony with those which will enable us to manifest the glory of the celestial.

I touch but lightly on the details of burial arrangements, though I trust I am calling emphatic attention to the guiding ideas in the light of which they should all be considered.

One more matter I will refer to—the question as to the costliness of funeral and burial arrangements. As far as the poor are concerned, we who are gathered here to-day have long resolved to do our utmost to prevent the expenses of a funeral being burdensome to them. And even with regard to the wealthy, may not this be said that it would be well if all funeral arrangements for both rich and poor were marked by a like reverent simplicity? Why should not henceforth all memorial monuments be of moderate cost? Doubtless the wealthy will desire to express their esteem of the one who has gone from them in some way involving reasonable costliness. Let whatever be done be done not for the aggrandisement of one Christian family, but to promote the welfare of all. Our churches are the common home of us all. Within them we all, rich and poor, have to consider ourselves to be but one family. They bear testimony to this, that we while dwelling amid terrestrial things direct our aspiration towards things celestial. Let every rich man's funeral be therefore an occasion not for the erection of a costly monument, but for bestowing a gift upon the fabric of the house of God, so that its usefulness as a place of gathering may be increased, so that its adornments may be added to, so that its windows and walls may bear upon them the impress of divine thoughts and feelings cherished in human minds and hearts. We should thus be enabled to realise more constantly our oneness with one another as children of the Lord. Let us therefore uplift before our brothers and sisters this thought as to how they may ever be made conscious of their oneness with all around them, may be ever earnest in their endeavours to promote the comfort and health of all, and in their efforts to sweeten and purify the earthly experiences of the toiling many, and uplift them to the realm of thought and love. If thus they are earnest in their brotherly and sisterly aims they will help on the fuller discernment of the glory of the celestial, and they will enable also the glory of the terrestrial to be more beneficently manifested.

THE DIVINE GRASP.

By the Rev. GEORGE JANNINGS, M.A., Rector of Warmsworth, Doncaster.

Sermon Preached at Warmsworth, on Sexagesima Sunday, February 14th, 1889.

"I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus."—Philip iii. 12.

THERE is a tendency in the human mind to think more of what is expected of us, in the work of our salvation than of what God has already done and is prepared to do for us, and this tendency leads in many instances to a species of self-worship and self-righteousness, which shows itself in various ways, according as the intellectual,

the emotional, or the moral element predominates in the inner part of our being:—

1. Some men set out with the idea that it is necessary to understand everything before they commit themselves to the serious step of casting in their lot with the people of God. At any rate, they think that they are in a manner justified in suspending their decision until they can see their way through the perplexities, which seem to them to present an insuperable bar to their further progress. There is this or that thing in the Bible which they cannot get over; certain statements which seem incredible, and which appear to be contradicted by modern scientific discovery; certain doctrines which do not accord with their sense of justice, and which seem to be irreconcilable with what is elsewhere said of God's much-enduring pity and tender love; or certain discrepancies which seem to militate against the infallibility and inspiration of the Bible.

Now without denying that difficulties of this kind, or somewhat similar ones may sometimes be very real, and may give rise to honest doubts, we may still safely say that they are often greatly exaggerated by our own misconception and misunderstanding, and it can hardly be doubted that many of them arise entirely out of our own ignorance and inability to take in the whole truth. We have very imperfect data to go upon, and yet men judge as if they knew the whole of the matter, and speak often as if it were expected of them to be able to understand all mysteries, and as if their inability to do it, and the difficulty, which they find in some things, were a justification of their neglect of the duty which lies nearest to them. They, think, too much of what is due to themselves. They lean on their own understanding, and set it up as an idol to be worshipped. God has given us our powers of understanding, and He knows exactly how far they will reach. He will never blame us for failing to comprehend the reasons of all that He does, or of all that He permits. "His wisdom, He knows, is unsearchable, and His judgments past finding out." He does not expect us to understand everything, but He does expect us to trust Him where we cannot trace Him. When Nicodemus, failing to comprehend the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, said, "How can these things be?" our Lord did not blame him for failing to comprehend the manner of the new birth; He reproved him rather for his want of faith. He replied not "If I have told you earthly things and ye understand not"; but "If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?"

2. And as there are some who make a sort of idol of their own intellect, fancying that it must be propitiated and appeased, and that its demands must first be satisfied, thus laying upon themselves a burden, which God has nowhere commanded us to bear, so there are many of a less inquisitive, but more emotional turn of mind, who depend not so much on their understanding as on their feelings. They mean well, they wish to be right, but, as they say, they don't feel right.

It is a great mistake to place feeling before faith, before practice. We should look upon it as the height of absurdity, in the matters of common life, to suspend our belief in good news until we should experience some of the joyful feelings which good news is fitted to produce, or to put off doing that which commended itself to our judgment as a right and proper thing to do, because our feelings were not deeply moved in the matter.

We may say, indeed, that religion is a subject in which our deeper feelings are concerned, feelings which are not likely to be stirred by the ordinary matters of daily life, and, no doubt, this is true; but still it is a reversal of the proper order of things to put feeling before faith, before obedience. It is in reality depending on ourselves and not on God. We are looking to see what we can find to offer to God. We are acting as if it were written, "he that feels happy and not he that believeth shall be saved." It is in their own goodness that such persons are often really trusting, and not in Christ's finished work.

Their test of character and of meetness for heaven is the having or not having much religious feeling. If they have it, they feel justified in enrolling themselves among the sanctified and the saved. If they have it not, they are filled with discouragement and despondency, and mourn over their spiritual deadness and decay.

And truly the religious feeling, the spiritual joy, which dies out, in consequence of our neglect of spiritual duties, or other wilful sin, is a thing to be mourned over, the loss of which may well make us fear lest, through our own carelessness or self-will, we should at last lose the heavenly crown.

Nor am I saying, observe, that to be destitute of all deep and earnest feeling with regard to a subject of such vital interest and vast importance as our own eternal salvation, is at all a good sign, or that it is a state of things with which we ought to be satisfied. We none of us feel half as deeply as we ought the greatness of God's love to us. Our hearts are too seldom filled with thankful joy in view of the promises which He has made to us, and of the hopes which he has set before us. To have experienced no emotion of any kind, either of fear, or sorrow, or hope, or joy, is a sure sign that the great truths of the Gospel have never been vividly apprehended, and have laid no real hold upon our hearts; but it by no means follows from hence that anything so changeful and fluctuating as our good feelings is a safe test of our spiritual state. To rest our hopes of favour and acceptance with God on our frames and feelings, is none the less self-righteousness than to depend upon our good works. It is for us indeed to cherish pious emotions, to thank God when He bestows upon us

any measure of joy and peace in believing, to be very jealous over ourselves, lest, by duties left undone or evil thoughts permitted, we grieve the Good Spirit who is the Author of all that is good in us, and provoke Him to depart from us; but to judge of our state by our feelings, to say, as it is often said when it is a question of acceptance and salvation, when the soul is full of anxiety as to its prospects for another life, "I wish I could feel right" is in reality looking for something in ourselves which will entitle us to conclude that God will accept and forgive; it is, in short, looking to ourselves for salvation, instead of hearkening to that Word of God which says to us, "Look unto Me and be ye saved all ye ends of the earth."

3. The same spirit of self-dependence underlies the oft-used phrase, "I am not good enough, I wish I were better than I am." It is a very becoming confession, a very proper wish. We certainly are not "good enough" to come to the Lord's table, much less to enter heaven and to sit down at the marriage supper of the Lamb. We have good reason to wish to be better than we are, we have no cause to be well satisfied with ourselves, not even in respect of social and domestic duties, in temper, in thoughtfulness, and sympathy for others, much less in the spiritual duties of love and devotion towards God in alacrity and readiness for His service; and there are few among us, probably, who would venture to appear before God and lay claim to His favour, on the ground of any actual and positive goodness of their own, but yet there is a sort of negative self-righteousness, lurking under the common confessions of unworthiness to which I have referred.

Men confess that they are not good enough to go to the Lord's table, that they are not fit to die, often without a trace of fear or emotion, in a cold, unconcerned way, just as they might excuse themselves from going to an ordinary feast, or from going amongst a well-dressed company, because they were not just then fit to appear in such an assembly.

This is a state of mind which, in view of the issues which are at stake, is simply appalling. Men either cannot have fully considered what they are saying, what it really amounts to, or (which is perhaps the more common case) they sincerely mean what they say—are really deterred from taking part in the highest act of Christian worship from a sense of the inconsistency which their lives would present to such a solemn act of worship and professed allegiance; and, as a natural consequence of this state of things, they feel also that they are not in a state in which they would wish death to find them; but then they intend to be good enough, and to make themselves ready for death at some more convenient season, and it is this good intention which allows them to remain in this state of felt and acknowledged unpreparedness for their passage out of time into eternity, without being shocked and alarmed by the very confession of their unreadiness.

But what does this confession of unworthiness and unfitness, coupled with the tacit intention of making ourselves fit some time hence, really mean and imply. It means, although he who makes the confession may be totally unaware of it, that we are trusting, if not to what we are, yet to what we intend to be, trusting in ourselves, in a goodness and fitness which we purpose to attain to, and not in the living God.

And what is it that the procrastinating sinner, who confesses that he is not fit now to eat of the bread of life—or to close his eyes in death—what is it that he is going to do, and when does he intend to do it? Is he going to say longer and more fervent prayers than he has ever said before? He cannot thus buy his soul's salvation. Many prayers, if there be none of the true spirit of prayer, will avail nothing; he will not be "heard for his much speaking"! Does he purpose to mourn even to tears over the sin and the neglect in which he now wilfully continues? If he cannot weep now over his sin that he acknowledges, and yet clings to and loves, why should he think that longer continuance in sin will make the heart more susceptible, and the conscience more tender? Can we call up at our will the tears of penitential sorrow? And when is this work of making ourselves fit for heaven to be entered upon? At what period of the uncertain future shall we begin the task? Will anyone here, who is knowingly putting off repentance, venture to fix the date of his commencement of a new life? If it depends upon good intentions, experience proves that the work is too often postponed indefinitely, and that it consists at last of mere resignation to the inevitable. To say nothing now of the probability that we may never have an opportunity of carrying out our good intentions; of the possibility that death, who knocks impartially, as the old Roman poet says, "at the cottages of the poor and at the palaces of kings," may overtake us with his stealthy step and lay his icy finger upon us, when we least suspect his coming, the very purpose and intention that we will do something or other to recommend ourselves to God's favour, and to make ourselves fit for heaven, betrays a lurking spirit of self-righteousness, a total misapprehension of what God requires of us, and an almost entire forgetfulness of what Christ has done in the past, and of what He is yet prepared to do for our souls. We look to ourselves instead of to Him. We offer incense to our own understanding, or we look to our good feelings for signs of acceptance, or we trust to our own good intentions and resolutions. We think too much about ourselves and of what is required of us, and far too little of Jesus and of what He has done and is prepared to do for us. Men sometimes think they are safe because they have a clear perception of the truth, or because they feel happy, or because of their good moral

conduct, but we are really safe because Jesus our Saviour has bought us with His redeeming blood—because the Spirit of the living God is within us to save us from the power of sin—because God our Father has us in His mighty keeping, and underneath us are the everlasting arms.

An eminent servant of God was once asked, "How am I to know when I have got hold of God, because sometimes I seem to have got a real hold upon Him, whilst at others I can realise nothing?" His answer was, "You have not got hold of God, but He has got hold of you."

That reply—so profound, so wise, so true—was the germ and has been the key-note of this discourse. Let us remember that if we forget everything else that has been said. It is the true interpretation of the words of the text, "I follow after if that I may lay hold of that, for which also I am laid hold of by Christ Jesus."

Our safety depends not on our being able to understand anything, or to feel anything, or to do anything, but in the fact that God in Christ has wrought out a mighty salvation for us, because Jesus our Saviour is anxious for our salvation; and if we but put forth the hand of faith to lay hold of Him, and do not wilfully refuse His light and easy yoke, He will never let us go, and will "suffer no one to pluck us out of His hand."

The chief thing we need is to know and feel and believe in our hearts that the love of Jesus is a very real thing—the greatest treasure and blessing that we can possess. Let us only believe it. Believe in His word: yea, in Him who spake it and who gave Himself for us, and that love will be ours. We shall learn to love Him who hath first loved us, and a sense of His love towards us will be shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost.

We shall learn, then, rightly to use our understanding, and yet not to lean upon it; to cultivate holy joy, and yet not despair in the absence of it; to follow after righteousness, and yet not put our trust in anything that we do. May we all acquire this holy learning, so shall the love of Jesus keep us from sin, and comfort us in trouble; it will sweeten and purify the love we bear to those who are dear to us on earth, and fit us for the purer and more enduring love of the holy ones that are around His throne. Encompassed by the love, and shielded by the watchful guardianship of such a friend who is no less mighty than He is willing to help and to save, we shall be safe at all times, safe amid the storms and trials of this troublesome world—safe for ever in the quiet haven of eternity.

ERRATUM.—In our leading article, "A Good Friday Meditation," on 10th line from top of page 201, there was a misprint, which we hasten to correct, "An angel shall roll away the stone, though the Deity Himself restored Himself to life. Vain man will not allow this fact, *but* (this should be *that*) he may confound the humanity and the Deity together."

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly
CURED
by simply using the
AMMONIAPHONE
FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.
21s. post free.
WILL LAST FOR YEARS.
Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials may be had FREE OF CHARGE on application to Medical Battery Co. Ltd.
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1889.

THE NEW CODE.—I.

BY this time no doubt most of our readers will have examined, or read extracts from and comments upon, the New Code. Since the 18th April, Press, Teachers, and Managers have devoted much time and thought to its alterations and innovations which are numerous and sweeping. Conferences of the clergy, summoned by their archdeacons and rural deans, have debated upon what are certainly startling changes, affecting not merely the limit and efficiency of the voluntary system of education, but even its very existence. In our present remarks and those of a subsequent article we propose to deal with the subject as bearing upon the voluntary schools, and such matters as are of primary importance to them. No *open* attack is here made upon religious education, for the simple reason that that would be impossible in a measure professing to treat exclusively of the secular instruction of the community. It must therefore be done by more disguised means. The first alteration is a sensible one. It relieves Managers from the responsibility of guarding the health of children who, from weakness of body or mind, or from other causes, may be exempted from the full routine of the time-table. This is No. 8. With it we must couple No. 85A (N.B.), as these are the only two passages affecting the *health* of the scholars, beyond the examination of the premises by the Inspector. The school premises are to be constructed in general conformity to the "Rules for planning and fitting up Public Elementary Schools issued by the Department." What are these Rules? We are left to find out, instead of their being attached to the Code, as they and every other document referred to therein should be. Then

follow these momentous words: "In every case the department will endeavour to secure at least 100 cubic feet of internal space, and 10 square feet of internal area for every unit of average attendance." If the words "in every case" had been left out, and in their stead had been inserted others, to the effect that this order would not affect existing schools, nor those cases where the population around the school was not excessive, this would have been a decided advance towards sanitary improvement. As the clause now stands, however, it is unsatisfactory and intrusive. We are always most cordial in our support of anything likely to preserve the *Mens sana in corpore sano*; but we see nothing of any consequence to be gained in this respect by the proposed changes in rural districts where the atmosphere is unpolluted and the surroundings, are free from noxious influences. Of course if there be a bad drain under the school-room floor, or children be admitted whilst in the desquamating stage of measles or scarlatina, it matters little what area be allotted to each child, for they must expect to pay the penalty. But when all is as it should be, the 80 cubic and 8 square feet of the old Code will amply suffice, and be far better, sanitarily speaking, in the rural districts, than the 100 cubic and 10 square feet of the proposed arrangement would be in a closely packed black town. It is very manifest that if this new departure be rigidly enforced it must tell disastrously upon the Voluntary Schools. In spite of Lord Cranbrook's attempt to reassure us, we have no sufficient pledge that our church schools will not be pressed very hard, and we ought not to rest contented until this article be removed or remodelled. This one, taken together with No. 73, which increases the number of teachers required, and thus by adding to the staff adds proportionately to the expense, appears to be directly aimed at crippling the resources of the Voluntary Schools, while it adds to the enormous leakage which the Boards involve—a leakage which increases year by year, instead of diminishing as its advocates foretold that it would do. At the end of the first year's existence of the Boards, the returns showed that, for the educational distribution of little more than £1,200, the country had to pay in costs £32,000, including (what were by no means insignificant items in the sum total) easy chairs, red tape, and sealing-wax. But where the pressure will fall upon the non-State aided schools will be in the matter of the two additional *square* feet per unit of average attendance. You cannot always raise a roof to gain more cubic space without encroaching; but you cannot in any case widen a building in area, and not at the same time lessen someone's privileges, even if you do not interfere with their rights, to say nothing of the expense. So that, even were the money ready to purchase it, the rights of private property would in many cases preclude the extension demanded by the department. We must confess that it would have been more in accordance with the elementary principles of sanitation if, instead of making this arbitrary decree for more space, the framers of a Code which is not permitted to recognise *godliness*, had sought to secure greater *cleanliness* amongst the juvenile population. To have insisted that each child should come to school clean in person and in raiment, however poorly it might be clad, would have been to confer a national benefit. What difference will 10 cubic feet make to a wretched child who has not been properly washed for a week or more, and during the whole of that period has worn some of its clothes without a break? The proposed change looks plausible enough; but we read between its lines no solicitude for the children's health; but rather a hidden thrust at the voluntary system. Another of these changes is as uncalled for as it is unjust. Articles 37 and 38 are intended to stop up the source whence, in Roman Catholic schools more especially, so much help flows to the teaching staff through outsiders, ladies who are known as "secondary persons." They have hitherto been allowed to do the work of pupil teachers on passing the examinations required by the Code. Now they are effectually shut out by the further requirement, "also a certificate from the managers that he or she has *received instruction* in two of the class subjects for the *two years immediately preceding* the engagement." If this be allowed to stand, all the help thus gratuitously obtained must in future be paid for. We pointed to the ultimatum of all this tinkering some two years ago when advocating the claims of Voluntary Schools to be represented before the Royal Commision by as many signatures as could be obtained. It is clearly to drive religion, in fact and in semblance, out of the field of National Education altogether, and the war-cry is still "God or no God." However, if an "unsectarian" State (or Corporation of Ratepayers) break faith with those who, relying upon the avowed impartiality of the Act of 1870, have supported the schools then in existence, and built many others all over the country, they will be made to suffer as they deserve. They will either have to build new, or buy existing schools at a high price; for the proprietors will not be ridden over rough-shod, and allow the use of their property—the outcome in most instances of great exertions and self-sacrifice for the sake of their religion—to be hired at a nominal rent.

In a subsequent article we shall continue our review of the New Code, commenting upon some of Mr. Gladstone's past utterances on Education, and upon the questions of schools being used for political meetings, and the substitution of rates for school pence, as leading up to Mr. Chamberlain's latest prophecy of Free Education.

THE Rev. B. F. Westcott, Regius Professor of Divinity (Cantab.), has been appointed Lady Margaret's preacher.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

THERE are few of us who can bear with any show of equanimity—none, perhaps, who can endure without *some* feeling of inward resentment, suspicion, mockery—a blame where it is quite undeserved. Probably the majority of us would have to plead guilty to feelings of vexation when the censure we receive is not unjustly visited upon us; when we are but reaping as we have sown. As always, so to-day both Epistle and Gospel point us to something higher than ourselves; to a law of morality infinitely more noble and so more exacting than this world's code. The Epistle bids us consider that it becomes those who profess to be followers of their Risen Lord, to endure all things without murmuring; to remember that our Master suffered cruel indignities for those who were His bitter enemies and—received the same patiently. Only when we likewise endure grief wrongfully have we reached the first step in real imitation of our Pattern. The Gospel leads us on to think of still higher matters We have the beautiful allegory of the Good Shepherd, in which all our Lord's tender devotion and watchful care over us, His wandering wilful sheep, is so touchingly told. But here is more than unwearying thought and attention to those who so often repulse such goodness by their determined breaking from the fold. We are taught that even to the giving of His life, the True Shepherd cares for His flock. What an example of self-sacrifice is here set before us! How small do our puny kindnesses look before such entirety of self-abnegation! We, perchance, have been known to deny ourselves for those who love us or those who have benefited us, how few could willingly give up their lives to save others from *sin*, and those other enemies! See how much we have yet to attain to! Oh! let us set to work, that *our* part in the great work be not wanting. Our Collect points out the way. Christ came "to be a sacrifice" for our sin. Let us, then, "thankfully receive that His inestimable benefit," so entirely accept it as God's gift, that we may enjoy the imputed Righteousness of Jesus. Then He came also to be an "example of godly life." This, then, is the next step. Having by acceptance of Christ's Sacrifice crucified our sins, let us by His strengthening Grace "daily endeavour ourselves to follow the blessed footsteps of His most holy life." So shall each passing day find us steadily progressing towards the great God: the rest prepared for the people of God; a rest, let us not forget, commenced already by those who "fight manfully under His banner against sin, the world and the devil."

Reviews and Notices.

"EFFICIENCY OF IRISH SCHOOLS PROVED AND EXPLAINED." By Maurice C. Hime, M.A., LL.D., Head-Master of Foyle College, Londonderry. London: Simpkin & Co., pp. 84. 1s.

THE title upon the cover is as given, but within we find the important addition, "and their Superiority to English Schools as places of Education for Irish boys." It is to be feared that if the charges be brought against English schools as places of education for *English* boys, the thesis might be equally well sustained.

The writer is an Irishman speaking to Irish parents, and his plain advice is, "Do not send your boys as you are in the habit of doing to be taught in England."

He asserts that, although the wealthy classes of Ireland usually send their sons here for instruction, exceedingly few of these become distinguished men.

Conversely, he maintains that an overwhelming majority—90 per cent.—of eminent living Irishmen have been educated in their native isle.

We have tabular statements, and we have list after list given of celebrities to bear out the statements referred to. If Dr. Hime be correct, whether you take the successful Irishman in Ireland, or the foremost Irishmen in England and the Colonies, Bishops or Victoria Cross men, Professors or Judges, Engineers or Editors, it was not at an English school that their early training was obtained.

The book recommends home education on other grounds which do not concern ourselves, but the tacit indictment against schools in this country needs our careful attention. Speaking of our great establishments, he says that the presence of boys having rich friends, and with no incitement to work hard, is detrimental to progress.

Irish poverty is a great spur to Irish scholarship. He complains that our holidays are too frequent and too extended. He says, and says most truly, that huge classes, extending even to fifty or over, cannot be properly taught by one master, and every experienced teacher will here be in entire agreement with the writer. He tells us that twelve or thirteen is a fair number, even the utmost number that one man can successfully deal with as individuals.

Strongly does he insist on a constant personal supervision, not by "prefects," drill sergeants, or beadles, but by young trustworthy masters, who shall be as elder brothers to the lads.

"School boys' honour" he laughs at, and brings strong testimony from Farrar, and even from Arnold, to justify his fears for boys left as ours so frequently are to the tyranny, cruelty and vice inseparable from school, where true supervision and restraint cannot be exercised.

Dr. Hime has not made the picture too dark when he tells of boys of sixteen or eighteen leaving school confirmed drunkards, or contaminated by the most evil vices of our nature.

Space does not allow of our following the learned author into minor questions. Enough has been mentioned to show how earnestly a change is needed in the entire management of our schools, even if Dotheboys Halls be less common than formerly.

"THE PASTORAL EPISTLES." By Rev. Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D. The "Expositor's" Bible. Pp. 430, Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

THESE Epistles, early rejected by the extreme sectaries, have recently been disputed by the matter of fact critics of these times, the materialists joining hands with the mystics who held matter to be the one source of evil. All through this volume the arguments for the genuine character of these writings are again and again brought convincingly to the mind. Sound reasoning and sober fact are opposed to the theories of writers who would either destroy the Christian faith or resolve it into vague Buddhist teachings. As we read, the persons, incidents, difficulties and

errors of those days pass before us. The Christian society is traced from the descriptions in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and in these Epistles, on through the Didache and the writings of Justin Martyr, till we reach its full development in the time of Irenæus; nor, as it would seem, does the writer think it impossible for that "tunnel," through which for a certain season Church History passes, to be eventually thrown open to the light of day.

While holding fast by existing arrangements, supported as these are by seventeen centuries of prescriptive right, Dr. Plummer feels free to state that extempore prayer, baptism by immersion, and great latitude as to the ministrants in the service existed in sub-Apostolic times.

In these books of the New Testament occurs many a passage suggesting deep matter for reflection. We may instance the delivery of certain offenders to Satan, on which there are excellent remarks as to the personal existence of a Spirit of Evil, the ministration of women in the church, the question of second marriages, the recent notion of S. Paul being the author of the Third Gospel and of the Acts, the story of Jannes and Jambres, and the extent to which S. Paul may have been acquainted with Greek literature.

Controversial matters are not numerous, and when these are handled it is not in a controversial tone. Dr. Plummer decides that Onesiphorus was dead at the date of the Second Epistle to Timothy, and consequently that the prayer of the Apostle (2 Tim. i. 18) was for one no longer in this life.

Several pages are given to this point and to the whole question respecting prayers for the dead: the subject is thoughtfully reasoned out, and it does seem to us that the writer proved his deduction "that neither Scripture nor the English Church forbids prayers for the departed, that on the contrary both of them appear to give a certain amount of sanction to it, and that what they allow reason commends and tradition *recommends most strongly*."

On 1 Tim. iii. 16, the rendering "who was manifested" is supported, and the whole passage is received as a fragment of an ancient antiphonal hymn, probably one of those mentioned by Pliny. Other Liturgical forms are detected in this and the Second Epistle. The translation "every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable," though accepted, is not placed beyond doubt, and the change from "all" to "every" is hardly thought desirable. There are excellent practical remarks on female dress, evil speaking, false teachings on the Christian life, and the danger of trusting in religion to mere emotional feelings.

We find equally condemned the foolishness of attempting to convert S. Paul's "cloak" into an ecclesiastical vestment, and the dishonesty of evaporating Gospel terms till "Miracle," "Church," and even "God," become words without any definite meaning.

It would be well if all Christian ministers possessed and studied books like the present, which are marked by sound learning and Christian tone.

AFTER service at York Minster on Thursday, the 25th ult., Canon Lord Forester, attended by Mr. H. A. Hudson, registrar, and acting as commissioner for the Archbishop of York, proceeded to the Chapter-house and formally prorogued the Northern Convocation until the 23rd inst

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE MINISTRY OF EVIL.

SIR,—I shall be glad if permitted to offer some observations on the letter from Mr. Sandlands in this day's PULPIT under the head of "God's Sovereignty."

The following ideas are very old acquaintances of mine. He says:

"We do not know—we can only guess—why God permits evil. . . . . God is a Sovereign Lord. Why does He permit the evil? He could stop it all. Why does he not"?

It seems to me that such thoughts amount practically to insinuations against the wisdom and benevolence of God, and I do not see much difference between such declarations and those of infidels. Hume said he did not believe the Deity possessed infinite power and goodness, as he considered those attributes inconsistent with the disorder and misery on the earth.

Thirty years ago the conviction flashed upon me, after reading the Bible through several times, that it is the firm purpose of God to deliver all the intelligent creation from evil through the superior energy of moral good. After that I naturally strove earnestly to explain to myself why evil has existed at all. The following are extracts from a book I published in 1870:—

It is difficult to understand how intelligent men, who have, at any rate, the lessons of this life to guide them, could possibly suppose that created beings springing into existence without any knowledge and experience, might be fitted to deal with all the contingencies and possibilities of the universe, during an interminable duration, by being introduced into a pleasant course of life, somewhat analogous to gilded saloons of polished etiquette, sweet smiles, soft phrases, and luxurious surroundings.

Our knowledge of good, as well as evil, in this life, is chiefly obtained through the influence of contrasts. Should we have impressive notions of light, beauty, comfort, kindness, health, if we had never become acquainted with their opposites? A large proportion of the contrasts we behold and experience, and perhaps almost all those which strongly exercise the emotional faculties, have been produced by the action of moral evil. Without it we could hardly have known hope and trust, unshaken courage, unwavering constancy, inextinguishable tenderness; there would hardly have been room for patient self-control, unflinching endurance, unhesitating self-sacrifice. It may also be conjectured on legitimate grounds that free agency cannot be created, but must be gradually formed and developed under suitable nurture.

We may imagine two modes of training intelligent beings for an endless existence. The one is the "Happy Valley" system of careful shelter, and mild, but forcible constraint, the idea of which is suggested in Johnson's "Rasselas." The other is the system of free exposure to dangers and contingencies, with the inevitable result of moral evil and its countless woes. Under the one (if all intelligent creatures had been thus trained), their knowledge would have been circumscribed, their faculties would have had limited scope for expansion, and, indeed, it might be conjectured, that they must have always remained more like puppets than free agents, with vital, distinct individuality and personal identity. Under the other, there was the certainty of incalculable disorder, corruption and misery, and in the judgment of any finite mind, a fearful risk of overwhelming ruin. But, if the grand experiment should be carried out with success, the result would be an universe of intelligent creatures, full of life and vigour—well acquainted with danger in every form—cognisant of the most complicated relations, contingencies, and liabilities, conversant with the most diversified emotions, conceptions and ideas, and having all their faculties and sensibilities developed into a consciousness of energy, free movement and expansion, whereby they would be fitted for an immortality of safety, happiness, and never-ending progress.

There seems to be no reason to suppose from the declarations of the Bible that any creatures have been, or are being trained, without exposure to temptations and sufferings. The words "the angels which kept not their first estate" (Jude 6); also "God spared not the angels that sinned," are very significant. The holy angels must continue to suffer greatly, as they constantly behold sin in its naked hideousness, which we seldom do in this life. They are evidently cognisant of the grand dramas of Evil and Recovery (1 Pet. i. 12), "which things the angels desire to look into."

It seems clear to my mind that the gloomy doubts and perplexities of Christian men about evil are owing to their belief that a large part of intelligent beings will be abandoned for ever to sin and misery. They talk about the Sovereignty of God, but are unwilling or unable to perceive that the Sovereignty of God will bring about the complete triumph of good over evil. They cannot appreciate and make their own the beautiful thought of Thomas Erskine: "God judges, not to destroy, but to teach and save."

J. B.

Canonbury, 20th April, 1889.

WHAT IS THE CAUSE OF ALL OUR DIVISIONS?

SIR,—I trace all to ignorance of the Church Catechism. As it was intended for children, it contains only the very essentials of Christianity. Yet it is not believed—not only by children, not only by Sunday-school teachers, who train our children, but even by our clergy, who have to instruct these very teachers.

But you will say that our clergy try to understand the Catechism which they profess to teach. No such thing! Its first principles are tabooed. We have in Dublin weekly meetings of the clergy. Such a question as Baptismal Grace is scouted out of it. Not that it is an axiom not to be questioned, but that it is something hopeless and useless to discuss. What do you English think of that? Swift talks of the philosophers of Laputa discussing about cucumbers and rays of sun. So our clergy discuss the future state, and other mysteries; but they will not touch the A B C of the faith, as to be learnt by children in the Catechism. What would you think of geometricians, by the way, looking with rapture at the plate of the 49th Proposition, who would not agree as to the shortest line between two points, nor allow it to be discussed? What would you think of scholars praising Virgil or Horace, who cannot agree as to grammar or prosody, or allow the question to be mooted? You say that we are a droll race. We certainly are. We will prate about the Differential Calculus, whilst we deny, and will not listen to the proof that two and two make four. We look with rapture at an Ogham or an Assyrian in Scripture, but will not permit the different letters to be ascertained. I will give an illustration of our madness, almost incredible, but true, *me teste*. In the diocese of Kildare I visited, as rural dean, a parish school, in which, with much complacency, the rector examined a class of bare-footed boys and girls, in what do you think? The Greek Testament—no less! I forget whether they had each a copy. If not, it was handed on from one to the other. They read it well. The clergyman asked them the Greek for "body," and the English for *ἄρτος* and *σάρξ*, and they answered correctly. I ventured to ask, Do they know the grammar? You may marvel. "We don't meddle with grammar." I shut up—*cui bono?* It was hopeless; it was madness. This is the way divinity is taught, is learnt here, by those who are to instruct the Sunday-school teachers, who are to instruct the children. I know the proverb about "the ill bird," but I want the nest to be cleansed. I am sick of hearing about our Divinity School. Are the present clergy well trained in it? What do they know? or teach? They discuss questions transcendental, about the cherubim, inspiration, etc., but they do not know the A B C, and will not entertain it. Is there a Church paper or a clerical meeting that would allow the first step in the Christian life to be discussed? They criticise the Athanasian Creed, but they know not the first principles of the faith. Thus a man might prate about squaring the circle, and disallow the axioms of Euclid; might not know the multiplication table, and yet talk of cubic equations; might prose about Cicero and Horace, and yet know not a word about syntax or prosody. The whole thing is most discreditable, and calculated to ruin the character of our University as well as of its theological teachers.

I will now take the first answer on sacraments in the Catechism, which, if proposed in one of our clerical meetings, would be hissed or laughed out of court. One might as well moot among Romish priests the right of private judgment. But I must reserve the examination for a further letter. I must consider that you cannot allow unlimited space to any one writer, or any one subject.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

PROFESSOR BONNEY'S SERMON.

SIR,—In the sermon by Professor T. G. Bonney in your paper of to-day, the following sentence occurs: "Defect of perception, failure of memory, and the like, must have been as possible to Him as to us." With this I would like to compare *τέλειος θεὸς καὶ τέλειος Ἄνθρωπος ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ ἀνθρωπίνης σαρκὸς ὑποστάς*, and to ask, are the old land-marks of our theology going to be removed? I always thought that Jesus was "*perfectus homo*" as well as "*perfectus Deus*," and that in His Person "two whole and *perfect* natures" were united.

That He "*grew* in wisdom" we admit: that there were any "defects" in His understanding we deny.

R. DONALDSON.

April 20th, 1889.

THE Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge has given notice of the arrangements which have been made for the election to the vacant Professorship of Greek. The candidates are required to send in their names before May 15th, and to attend on that day. Each candidate is to be ready to suggest two or more parts of books written in the Greek language which he is prepared to expound. On May 15th an hour will be assigned to each candidate for his exposition; and the Council of the Senate, having heard the expositions, will proceed to elect.

THE election to the Ely Professorship of Divinity at Cambridge will take place according to the most approved modern notions, and offers a curious contrast to the system which is still kept up for the Regius Professorships of Divinity, Hebrew, and Greek. Not all the members of the Council of the Senate are distinguished for classical scholarship; whereas the board

for the election to the Ely Professorship consists entirely of specialists. On the face of it, this may seem the better plan ; but it is so easy to calculate the proclivities of specialists, that there is some danger that the field may be unduly limited, and that suitable men, who feel that they have no chance with the board constituted as it is, may not apply. In the case of the Greek Professorship, as well as in that of the new Divinity Chair, a possible candidate is a member of the electing body. The election will take place on Saturday, June 1.

THE foundation-stone of the new parish church for Hove was laid on the 25th ult. by the Bishop of Chichester, the ceremony being preceded by special services in the existing parish church. The architect is Mr. J. L. Pearson. There was a heavy downpour of rain during the stone-laying, rendering it necessary to shorten the service, which was choral.

A NEW and amended scheme has just been issued by the Bishop of London by which the union of three City benefices will be brought about—namely, St. Mary Magdalen, Old Fish-street, St. Gregory by St. Paul, and St. Martin, Ludgate. St. Mary's, which was partially destroyed by fire some time since, will be removed. The site, says the *City Press*, is expected to produce about £12,000 to £13,000, and out of this £7,000 will be spent in the acquisition of a suitable residence for the rector of the united benefice. The remaining £6,000 will be devoted to building a church and parsonage-house in the metropolis, the district not having yet been named.

AN address and a purse containing over 250 guineas were presented on the 25th ult. to the Rev. S. J. Stone, vicar of St. Paul's, Haggerston, by his parishioners and others outside the district, to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of his birthday. The address refers to the fact that for twenty-five years Mr. Stone has been carrying on and extending the work begun by his revered father (the Rev. W. Stone) their first vicar. It also referred in high terms of appreciation to Mr. Stone's parochial work, and continued :—"We feel proud, too, to share in, however remotely, the honour of a connection which links us with the author of such a hymn as 'The Church's one foundation,' and of works that have caused one of our Bishops to designate you 'Bard of the Church of England.'" Allusion is also made to the splendid organisation of the parish and to the fact that to Mr. Stone they owed the blessing of large and successful Sunday and day schools, a Mission church, and many efforts for ameliorating the conditions of the ignorant, the sick, the blind, and the poor. It must have been in simple self-sacrifice that he had again and again declined the offers of important preferment in the Church, and it was something to cheer him, when he felt physical strength failing him, that his labours in the Lord's work had not been in vain, and that he had taken no mean part in proving that the clergy of the Church of England could nobly respond to the call now made upon them.

IT has been determined that a new pulpit in the choir of Norwich Cathedral would be an appropriate memorial of Dr. Goulburn's ministrations as Dean.

THE Rev. W. Page Roberts has recovered from his long and serious illness, and resumes his duties at St. Peter's, Vere-street, on Sunday.

THE Rev. P. R. Pipon Braithwaite writes to state that the announcement which appeared in our list of Preferments last week, that he had been appointed to the vicarage of Andover, is a mistake, and that it had not been offered to him.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Backhouse, Rev. E. B., Curate of St. Werburgh's, Bristol ; Rector of Helmingham, Suffolk.

Bacon-Phillips, Rev. J. P., A.K.C., Curate of Ewhurst ; Rector of Crowhurst, Sussex.

Bensted, Rev. T. J., M.A., Rector of St. George's, Manchester; Vicar of Spotland, Rochdale.

Burroughes, Rev. Edward R., Curate of Kidderminster ; Private Chaplain to the Bishop of Capetown.

Butterworth, Rev. J. C., Perpetual Curate of Banford, Manchester ; Perpetual Curate of Witherslack, near Grange-over-Sands.

Close, Rev. Robert Wells, M.A., Vicar of Pond's Bridge ; Rector of Connington, Cambridgeshire.

Cross, Rev. Edgar Herman, M.A., Rector of St. Michael's, Lewes ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Leicestershire.

Cummings, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A., Rector of Wembworthy, Devonshire.

Du Boulay, Rev. James H., Vicar of East Haddon, Northamptonshire.

Firmstone, Rev. Charles Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Earley, Berks.

Hudgell, Rev. Robert William, Rector of Derby, New Brunswick.

Keightley, Rev. G. W., Rector of Little Stambridge, Essex.

Lloyd, Rev. John, B.A., Second Minister of St. Paul's, Liverpool.

McCreery, Rev. Henry William, B.A., Vicar of Shippon, Berks.

Paine, Rev. Jesse, M.A., Rector of Eaton Constantine, Shropshire.

Ross, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Caynham ; Vicar of Waterbeach, Cambridge.

Ruck-Keene, Rev. E. R., M.A., Vicar of Withyham, St. John's, Sussex.

Shepherd, Rev. T. A. M., Curate of Hopetown, Normanton ; Curate-in-Charge of Bishop Waltham.

Warner, Rev. R., E. M.A., Vicar of Gainsborongh ; Prebendary of Corringham in Lincoln Cathedral, and Rural Dean of Corringham.

Wilkinson, Rev. John Hessay, Chaplain of Lausanne ; Chaplain of St. John's Church, Aigle.

Williams, Rev. Richard Hughes, M.A., Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Anglesey, and Rural Dean of Tyndaethwy.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Adams, Rev. Simon Thomas, M.A., for fifty years Rector of the parish, at the Rectory, Great Horwood, on the 24th ult., aged 81.

Carwithen, Rev. George Edmund, at Stoke, Devonport, on Easter Day, aged 65.

Cuxon, Rev. George Appleby, M.A. Oxon, at Gislingham, Eye, on the 22nd ult., aged 75.

Du Boulay, Rev. John George, late Curate of Haselbury Brian, on the 21st ult.

Irwin, Rev. John James, D.D., Vicar of Thornton-w.-Allerthorpe, on the 29th ult.

Phabayn, Rev. J. F. S., at Charlton Horethorne Vicarage, on the 21st ult., aged 79.

Sayce, Rev. Henry S., formerly Vicar of Caldicot, at Bath, on the 26th ult., aged 84.

The Church of England Pulpit.

EVIDENCES OF THE RESURRECTION OF OUR LORD.

By the Rev. Dr. MACLEAR, Warden of St. Augustine's College and Honorary Canon of Canterbury.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford.

"And they prayed, and said, 'Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew to these two the one whom Thou hast chosen. . . . And they gave lots for them, and the lot fell upon Matthias."—Acts i. 24, 26.

THESE words, appropriate to "the Orphan Sunday" of the Christian year, carry us back to the early twilight of the Christian dawn, to the period, which it is so difficult for us even to conceive, when the name "Christian" had not as yet been heard, and the Society, which afterwards bore it, had not emerged from Judaism.

The Ascension of the Lord was over. Calmly, quietly, without pomp or show, as though the incident formed but the natural conclusion of His life on earth, while He was engaged in familiar converse with the Apostles, while His hands were still uplifted in the act of benediction, He had ascended up where he was before.

Never did any body of men appear more truly "comfortless" more truly "orphans," than the Apostles, when their Lord was taken from them. "They were poor, they were illiterate, they were helpless. They could not claim a single synagogue or a single sword. If they spoke their own language, it betrayed them by its uncouth dialect. If they spoke Greek, it provoked the scornful contempt of the polished "citizen of the world." Since the Crucifixion the city of Jerusalem had been restored to its wonted calm. The excitement was over. The tumult had ceased. The foolish rumours of the disappearance of the Body of the Crucified had been, it was fondly hoped, stifled by heavy bribes and political statecraft.

But at the very hour when the colossal powers of the world appeared to be arrayed against the Apostles with a might absolutely irresistible, when to the eye of sense they were literally as children bereft of parents, when all was desolation and despair, they took their first step, they made their first "venture of faith" in their ascended Lord.

The place where it was made is itself full of suggestiveness. While He should be ascending to His Father's throne, their Lord had bidden them wait "for the promise of the Father." But where? Was it in some safe retreat in Northern Galilee? Was it in one of the caves of the mountain-range fringing the Dead Sea? Was it in some secure hiding-place far away beyond the Jordan?

On the contrary, it was in the very city of Jerusalem, where He Himself had been crucified, where were the most numerous sources of danger; where there would be the greatest disinclination to believe, and the greatest solicitude to confute any facts they might proclaim; where all the counter-proofs were in the hands of their enemies; where all the people, high and low, had been irrevocably committed in the transaction, and to whom the preaching of Christ crucified not merely abased their natural pride, but reproached them with the most odious national cruelty.*

And what did they do, when they had met together in their upper room? Do we trace anything of the excitement, of the high strung imagination, in which modern criticism has sought an explanation of the attitude they now assume towards their ascended Lord? So far from it, nothing can be conceived more artless or straightforward than the course they now adopted. They resolved to fill up the gap which treachery had made in their ranks. They did not do this in any secret, covert, underhand manner. They did it openly, fearlessly. Quite content to abide by the issue, they gave forth their lots, and the lots decided the matter.

"Let us follow out," says Pascal,† "the supposition that the Apostles were deceivers." Let us imagine those eleven men assembled together after the death of Christ, contriving a scheme, either falsely or in imagination, which should represent Him as raised from the dead. The human heart is strangely addicted to levity and change. It can be strongly warped by hopes and benefits. Let any one of the number have been dazzled by these attractions. Let others again have been terrified by the thought of imprisonment and death, and their design would have been ruined. "Follow out this," he continues, "and the consideration, if pursued, cannot fail of appearing as of great weight and advantage."

Now I propose to follow out the hint which Pascal gives us, and sealing up the testimony of the great Forty Days, through which we have just passed, to carry it a single step onwards.

The election by lot of the new member of "the Twelve" is a fact which cannot be disputed, unless we are prepared to deny the credibility of the Acts of the Apostles.

One condition—the most important one—of that election was, that the new member should be a witness with the rest of that Apostolic Body, of the Resurrection of our Lord.

The choice of such a witness in such a manner

* "Milman's Bampton Lectures," p. 86.
† Pascal's "Thoughts," p. 65.

was an indication of the straightforward, trusting, practical character of the religious life of the Apostolic age. It implies a satisfaction of a very complete kind, with the evidence on which the fact of the Resurrection rested, an assurance that it could stand the severest test. I say the severest test. For it is important to bear in mind what joining the Christian Society meant in these early times. Even if we allow that the majority of men were at this period uncritical and credulous, and that they were unacquainted with the rigorous demands of "exact science," yet it cannot be said that they were more credulous than men in every age have been found to be, when worldly interests are in jeopardy, and entire change of conduct is demanded, when old habits have to be broken up, and insult, contempt, danger, and a death of torment have to be confronted.

Now the conscious imposture, to which, in Pascal's time, many were inclined to impute the conduct of the Apostles, has given place in these days to the hypothesis of visions; and the consideration I would urge is, that this theory, independently of its own inherent weakness, is utterly insufficient to account for a very remarkable feature of the record of the Resurrection, viz., the congruity with all that has gone before, which the Gospels have preserved in their portraiture (1) of the Risen Saviour, and (2) of the witnesses of His risen life.

And first a single remark respecting the manner of the Resurrection itself. "A fact more momentous in its significance it is impossible to conceive, and yet it is related with such simplicity, calmness, and absence of strain and effort, that, as we read it, we almost forget the marvellous features of the occurrence, and can with difficulty realise its exceptional character."*

There is no apparent consciousness on the part of the writers that as an event it requires a more careful or elaborate authentication than any other. There is no anxiety betrayed to remove difficulties, to reconcile conflicting facts, or to reveal all that was evidently known. Not only is there no piecing together of the links in the chain of evidence, but the narrative is blended with confessions of fear, doubt, misgiving, and lengthened incredulity. Moreover, what is true of the style of the narrative extends to the description of the new life to which the Lord is restored.

All previous analogy could have represented it either as a restoration to mortal life, or as an immediate deification; but the Gospels represent our Lord as restored to a form of existence unknown alike to previous Jewish existence and to Hellenic mythology. He is represented as sustaining an entirely unprecedented phase of being. He comes and He retires; He appears and He vanishes away. The old life, with its wants, its special limitations, its submission to the laws of time and space, has given place to a new life, with fresh powers of action, and a new mode of being If His appearances were visions, how comes it to pass that they are not represented as such in the narratives? And why did the visions cease?

The writers of the Gospels were not unacquainted with such things as visions. Wherever they do describe them they make use of an appropriate phraseology, they employ specific terms. Why is this phraseology, why are these terms laid aside altogether in the description of the Resurrection? Why do the writers never say of the witnesses of the event, that they fell into a trance and beheld their Risen Lord?

They knew how to describe such scenes. Why do they not fall back upon familiar terms, instead of an entirely different kind of narrative?

But to come to the portraiture of the Risen Lord.

I. Nothing is more remarkable in the incarnate life of our Lord, as described by the Evangelists, than the uniform and stern reservation to a strictly moral purpose of the exercise of miraculous power.

His interpositions for the relief of human suffering appear to have been prompted by human impulses of compassion, and are uniformly devoted to ends entirely unselfish. They never degenerate into exhibitions of simple power, calculated to strike wonder and nothing higher into the minds of those who witness them. There is nothing about them, as has been often pointed out, merely "startling or theatric." * Stones are not turned into bread; signs are not multiplied from heaven; the marvel-mongering appetite, so peculiarly characteristic of Oriental nature, is not gratified.

Now, I think it is well nigh absolutely certain that no one but a recorder of actual facts would have thought of maintaining this stern reserve of miraculous power after the Resurrection. Had the account been dictated only by imagination, would it not at this point, at any rate, have striven to overawe the reader with unlimited exhibitions of superhuman power? Why should the reserve of past days be now retained? Might not the Conqueror of death now with justice gratify the repeated request for some sign from heaven? Might He not now call down fire upon His enemies? Might He not now vouchsafe some over-mastering manifestation sufficient to crush all opposition?

But is this what we find in the Gospel narrative? We are confronted with the exact contrary. As it was before so it is now. Startling, theatric, miracles are not wrought. Exhibitions of force and might for selfish ends are not vouchsafed. The twelve legions of angels, who, during His life of suffering, might by the faintest effort of volition have been effectually summoned to the Saviour's aid in His hour of humiliation, are not now invoked to herald His hour of triumph. Nothing occurs to mar the

* "Westcott's Gospel of the Resurrection," p. 330.

* See Isaac Taylor's "Restoration of Belief," p. 282.

Divine unselfishness of His life, or disturb the balance between what had gone before.

II. But if this marvellous reserve could have been maintained by the Evangelists in their description of the Risen *Life*, is it likely that they would have extended it to the *words* also of One, who had triumphed over death?

Before, indeed, there had ever been an unwillingness to gratify mere curiosity, and information was again and again withheld on many mysterious subjects from thoughtless inquirers. "Lord, are there few that be saved?" "Lord, when shall these things be?" "Lord, why dost thou manifest Thyself unto us, and not unto the world?"

These and similar inquiries had been made from time to time, and had either been put by with silence, or, if answered, the reply had ever been least directed to the gratification of mere curiosity, and most to the enforcing of some moral or spiritual lesson.

But might not the appearance of a Conqueror of Death have been the signal for all this to be reversed? Why shall information be now withheld? Why should not the spirit of inquiry now be gratified? On what point had the human mind been exercised more constantly in every age than on the mysteries of the spirit world, and the secrets of the life beyond the veil? Prayers, tears, entreaties, agonised remorse, had spent themselves in vain endeavours to wrest an answer from death's dull cold ear.

But was not this the very point, on which the Risen Lord might be expected to speak? Why should His utterances be now restrained? When, indeed,

> "Lazarus left his charnel cave,
> And home to Mary's house returned,
> Was this demanded—if he yearn'd
> To hear her weeping by his grave?
> 'Where went thou, brother, those four days?'
> There lives no record of reply.
> Which telling what it is to die.
> Had surely added praise to praise.
> Behold a man raised up by Christ!
> The rest remaineth unrevealed;
> He told it not; or *something sealed*
> *The lips of that Evangelist.*"

Why, however, should not the Conqueror of death have revealed respecting Himself what the Evangelist has not recorded respecting Lazarus? And yet, even in His case, the same solemn silence is maintained. Speculation is not rewarded. Curiosity is not gratified.

III. What is thus true of the reserve in the exercise of miraculous power, and the refusal to gratify mere curiosity, is true also of the portraiture of the Conqueror of death Himself.

To describe such a conquest, and in doing so to preserve the harmony of the character of the Conqueror, with all that had gone before, was a task transcending the art of the greatest master of fiction that ever lived. Never before, and never since, has it been even attempted. The idea has received form and substance only in the pages of the Evangelists, and has won the instinctive appreciation of generations of the sons of men. "The risen Christ, with all His dignity, appears in such unpretending humanity, in such a natural state of transition between human lowliness and divine glory, that the utter absence of all extravagance is a striking testimony to the truth of that which the Evangelists record."

Though invested with new powers and new attributes, the Risen One still remains the same as He was before in reference to His moral perfection.

There is the same tenderness and considerations the same loving forbearance, the same infinite patience, the same power of adaptation to individual wants, the same delicacy in dealing with individual character. We feel instinctively, as we read the records of His appearances after the Resurrection, that He, who reveals Himself to Mary of Magdala; who sends the special message to the penitent Peter; who reveals Himself to that Apostle alone; who removes the difficulties of the brave, but doubting Thomas; who is discerned in the early morning by the seven, on the shore of the Lake; is the very same of whom we have read, "going up and down" amidst the villages of Samaria, and the towns of Galilee.

What ordinary human writer, what "glorious dreamer," could have conceived of the union of unspeakable tenderness and infinite consideration with the awful, lonely, majesty of "the Firstborn from the dead?"

IV. But the same congruity with all that is gone before is noticeable, not only in respect to our Lord, but as regards also the witnesses, to whom He was pleased to "manifest" Himself. The use which Paley makes of the fact that these appearances were thus restricted to chosen witnesses is known to all. "The most common understanding," he remarks, "must have perceived that the history of the Resurrection would have come with more advantage if the Evangelists had related that Jesus appeared, after He was risen, to the Scribes and Pharisees, the Jewish Council, and the Roman Governor, or even if they had asserted the public appearance of Christ in guarded and qualified terms, without noticing, as they have done, the presence of His disciples on each occasion, and noticing it in such a manner as to lead their readers to suppose that none but disciples were present. They could have represented it in one way as well as the other. And if their point had been to have their religion believed, whether true or false—in a word, if they had thought of anything but the truth of the case, as they understood and believed it, they would, in their account of Christ's several appearances after His Resurrection, at least have omitted this restriction." But no less striking than this restriction is the fact that each, and all of these witnesses speak and act in a way which is in exact

accordance with all previous notions of them scattered up and down the Gospel narratives.

(*a.*) On the morning of the world's first Easter Day we are told that a company of holy women came to visit the Sepulchre. A single glance at the names convinces us that they form the same group which had been the witnesses of the Crucifixion.

We are not surprised, therefore, that the same constancy of affection which had made them the last at the Cross, makes them, also, the first at the Sepulchre.

But wherefore had they come? The question is answered by St. Luke, who tells us that they intended to complete the embalming of the Holy body. Such an object implied the possession of some means, and we learn in the most incidental manner from the same Evangelist, that in accordance with the custom of Jewish women to contribute to the support of Rabbis, whom they revered, Mary called Magdalene and many others ministered unto the Lord of their substance. They come before us now, apparently occupying a position of comparative wealth. Their action, therefore, in the early morning of the first Easter Day, is in strict harmony with this slight and incidental notice. They possessed wealth, they ministered of it to the Master in His lifetime, what more natural than that they should do the same in honour of His entombment?

(*b.*) The strange sights which awaited them and the strange sounds which alarmed them on reaching the spot, are familiar to us all. One of their number, Mary of Magdala—resolved to seek more effectual aid than such as weak women can afford, runs with all speed to Simon Peter, and announces to him, and the Apostle John that the tomb is empty. That she should have found the two Apostles together is striking enough, but it is in exact accordance with the glimpses we get of them on the night of the apprehension, and in the hall of Caiaphas.

(*c.*) But no less striking is the mode in which the two Apostles are respectively described as acting on receiving the intelligence. Both set out towards the tomb—St. John outruns his fellow Apostle as being in all probability the younger of the two The impetuous St. Peter on reaching the scene, advances whither his companion had scrupled to proceed. Both survey the empty grave: first, St. John casting a hasty glance, and then St. Peter, "less active in limb, but bolder, and not so finely strung in spirit," entering in and steadily contemplating the position of the grave clothes. Encouraged by the other's boldness, the Apostle John now ventures in also, and with the same attention, surveys the condition of the sepulchre, and then both are silent.

In the case of St. Peter, though he was ready at other times to speak out, his silence now harmonises exactly with recent occurrences. The tumult of emotions which must have filled the heart of him who had a few hours before three times denied his Lord, might well have unrestrained all power of utterance; but the silence of St. John, is it, or is it not in keeping with what we should have expected?

Though he was the disciple whom Jesus loved, and reclined upon His breast, yet the occasions on which he is recorded to have spoken are surprisingly few. "Rabbi, where dwellest thou?" "Lord, who is it that betrayeth Thee?" "It is the Lord!" These are the three only utterances which can be traced to him, and of these, the first is somewhat doubtful, while the second was due to the prompting of St. Peter. The idea that we form respecting him is that he was of a more silent nature than the others. Quiet, calm, reflecting, he feels more than he expresses, he revolves and considers inwardly, while his companion, with whom he is united by contrast of character, would have given free vent to his feelings.

But the same calmness is maintained at the Sepulchre. A single ejaculation, a hasty speech, and the picture would have been marred. As it is, the balance is preserved, and the silence, so unlike St. Peter, so characteristic of St. John, is accounted for, and we feel instinctively that it is the way of the disciple whom Jesus loved. Now, in a sketch, drawn largely as has been suggested, from imagination, or resting on visions, would a harmony in such minute particulars have been likely to be maintained?

(*d.*) But on the evening of the world's first Easter Day one of the Apostles was not present. Why he was not, we are not told. We know, however, how he avowed his inability to accept the testimony of his companions, and demanded the self-same evidence of the senses, which had been vouchsafed to them.

Who has not heard of the doubter amongst the Apostles? Who does not know how he was raised out of his doubts to the fulness of adoring faith? But was he chosen at random "to point a moral and adorn a tale?" The visionary hypothesis would make it indifferent which it was of the Apostolic company.

Historical continuity bids us look back and see if we can discern traces of the temperament, which now prompted so strong an avowal of inability to believe aught but the testimony of his own senses. And do we look in vain?

Who is it that says, when the Master is across the Jordan, and the message has come that Lazarus is dead, and there is personal danger to be apprehended, "Let us also go that we may die with him." Who is it that at the last supper replies to the Master's announcement of speedy departure. "Lord, we know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way?" Is it any other than St. Thomas?

But how completely is his unbelief in harmony with these other incidental indications of the temperament of one who fondly loved his Master, and

would follow Him even to death; but who ever looked on the darker side of things was inclined to melancholy, and while he "clung with tenacity to his pain," could make no ventures on uncertain grounds. The few scattered utterances, which join so easily to make a characteristic physiological unity, are not woven into the story just to distinguish the disciples. They occur just because they have their necessary place and their respective in the Evangelic narrative, and the traits they indicate agree together in one harmonious picture of one striking character.*

(*e.*) And what is true of St. Thomas is true also of each actor in the manifestation vouchsafed by the Galilean lake. On this occasion should we have expected anyone but St. John to be the first to recognise the Master's voice? Should we have expected anyone but St. Peter to fling himself into the lake and swim the two hundred cubits that lay between him and the shore? Could the action of either be interchanged without marring the consistency of the record? And when the wondrous morning meal is over, does the unearthly dialogue between the Risen One and the repentant Apostle sound like the echo of words heard in a dream by an enthusiastic disciple? Does the threefold inquiry, the thrice repeated answer, each time with a delicate shade of difference, the threefold charge "to feed the sheep and the lambs," read like a cunningly devised fable? Again, is it like or unlike what has gone before, that we find the now restored Apostle inquiring as to the future of his loved companion, while the companion again characteristically remains silent, and lets the other speak in his stead? What could we alter? What change could we introduce that would not destroy the symmetry of the picture?

And it is the same even to the end, even to the day when the twelve took the last walk towards Bethany ere He was parted from them, and commenced His heavenward ascent. All is simple, natural, unaffected; all is in keeping with what has been recorded before.

The more closely we examine the narrative, the more impressed we are by the congruity of every action of the Risen One, of every action recorded of those to whom He appears, with all preceding touches and traits of character, and all that we should have ourselves anticipated. A series of pictures, so true in their minutest particulars, could not have been drawn by the fancy of an enthusiast. We feel instinctively that they rest on an historical basis, and describe the historical facts, as true and real as the life of seclusion at Nazareth, and the Passion upon the Cross.

If we accept the Resurrection as a literal fact, we can understand what transfigured the Apostles from being cowards to brave men, who could wait patiently even in the midst of Jerusalem that so lately thirsted for their Master's blood, and entrust to the decision of the lot the election of a successor to the traitor Judas. We can understand how it came to pass that in spite of the shame of the Cross the Christian society could gather and concentrate itself round the Person of Him who died thereon, till the Cross became the symbol of a universal faith, and was blazoned on the conqueror's banner.

Without the fact of the Resurrection we have no clue at all to what has occurred. A "splendid guess," a "vague but loving hope," "the dawn of an enthusiast," will not bear the weight of the superstructure of the Christian Church. It is hopeless to reconcile what went before with the vast and overmastering change which came over the entire thoughts and feelings of the Apostles after the death of their Master, without some intervening fact as certain and as historically real as the death itself.

"The law of gravitation," it has been said, "accounts for the various phenomena of motion, the falling of a stone, the jet of a fountain, the orbits of the planets, and so forth. It is quite possible for anyone, who is so disposed, to reject this explanation of nature. Provided that he is allowed to postulate a new force for every new fact with which he is confronted, he has nothing to fear. He will then

> Gird the sphere
> With centric and eccentric scribbled o'er,
> Cycle and epicycle, orb in orb,

happy in his immunity. But the other theory will prevail, nevertheless, by reason of its simplicity." * And so it is with the Resurrection. The enormous weight of the effect produced by the belief in it, must crush every effort to derive it from anything but the fact that the Redeemer of the world did actually burst the bonds of death, by rising on the world's first Easter Day. And the way in which this is recorded to have taken place, and the record of His appearances afterwards, for minute harmony and congruity with all that had gone before, and for little touches of subtle agreement as regards the witnesses of the appearances, transcends all power of fiction, all flights of visionary enthusiasm, and presents us, if the fact of the Resurrection is not true, with "a literary miracle" well-nigh more inexplicable even than the Resurrection itself.

SPEAKING at a meeting held at Woolwich, under the auspices of the National Vigilance Association, the Rev. J. W. Horsley gave a deplorable account of the morals of that district, and said if he dared to expose such questions from the pulpit he would at once be met with that old hag Mrs. Grundy, who was the devil's best handmaid. Mrs. Grundy was the embodiment of fashionable prudery.

* Luthardt's Commentary on St. John's Gospel, i. p. 86.

* See the article of the Bishop of Durham on "Supernatural Religion," in the *Contemporary Review*, Feb., 1876

THE YEAR'S RECORD.

By the Rev. R. C. NUGENT KELLY, M.A.,
English Chaplain at Gothenburg.

Sermon Preached at Gothenburg, on Sunday, December 30th, 1888.

"And the books were opened; and ANOTHER BOOK was opened, which is the book of life."—Rev. xx. 12.

WITH a dying year one learns gradually to have almost a personal sympathy. There is something so suggestive of our own life as the number of the days slowly but surely reaches its end.

We are now already throwing our thoughts and expectations on into the new year—this fragment that remains is of so little account, it seems, that we practically ignore it. But why? Two days now are as large a proportion of the twelve months as two days in June or August. The sum of our life is made up of just such days. Can we afford to ignore any?

Yet there is such a universal consent to look on to that fresh chapter of life so soon to open, and which, in spite of reason and experience, we always persist in reckoning upon as likely to be more profitable to us than the old one, that there may be a truth worth looking for lurking underneath. Perhaps it is this. We feel that this year of 1888 is, to all intents and purposes, disposed of. If it has failed to yield us the great harvest we expected, it is certain that these two days will not make up the deficiency. The past is irrevocable. For good or bad the thing is done that we have put our hand to. Be the balance debit or credit, the account between ourselves and the world is as good as closed for this year, and we want to make haste and open a fresh account, with a fresh beginning. But stay! Is there not too much hurry about this? *That balance—debit or credit—will of a surety be the first entry on the clean new page of the morrow's account.* That is one of the most sobering facts in life. *You cannot rid yourself of your past.* The book may be closed and sealed, but its entries are all sure; it may any moment be re-opened. And re-opened or not, the new books—the new beginnings which we daily and yearly make—have, as their first starting place, the ending of the year or the day we have just passed out of. You begin your new year from the point you reached, morally, as well as physically, in the old year. The year is dead. Well, let it die. Let the dead past bury its dead. Yet even death is not the end. Hear this: "I saw the dead, great and small, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books according to their works."

We all acknowledge in cant phrase the shortness of life; but few believe their own words. Life does not look short except when we look back. To-morrow is always as long as our expectations, yesterday is as short as our realisations. But though the years and days slip by us faster and faster, they do not leave us as they found us. Each year's growth is to be counted on the tree by the number of the successive rings which form the trunk. So each year of our life is not a new thing taking the place of an old, but a new thing added to and placed upon the old.

We cannot take account of our whole life now and remedy its deficiencies and mistakes, but we can stand still for a few moments at such a distinct boundary line as a year's end and a year's beginning make, and learn "so to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom."

Nothing is ever lost; nothing ever really dies; nothing passes utterly away. That always seems to me to be one of the most fruitful and suggestive truths science has given us in these last days. Nothing departs, yet nothing stays. How then? All things change. There is constant unceasing death. Yet from this constant death is ever fresh life springing; and the fresh life is the outcome of the dead past. Now that is a good wholesome thought with which to brace ourselves up, friends, and turn manfully to meet the coming year. The past is gone from us. The last year is dead—well nigh buried. It began so bravely; it ends so tamely. Yet it has been lived. It was a great living reality put into our hands, and now its power passes on into its successor. But before we part with it, we will look at it once more with the thoughts suggested by this word of St. John to guide us.

"The books were opened." There is something so grimly matter of fact about those words. The silent record of facts—facts! truths!—bare unvarnished facts and truths—is just what we shrink from. We formulate elaborate theories to account to ourselves for any little faults and failings we may suspect or acknowledge. Our excuses and plausible reasonings are most convincing—to ourselves: not so very convincing to our friends, perhaps—but to ourselves comforting. But just as in a business ledger, the bare facts of stern, hard figures find place, and are, moreover, the great realities there, and no room is found for plausible explanations of those facts; so when the books are opened before "the great white throne" of the unsullied and dispassionate truth—it is the facts of life, the things done, whether they be thoughts, words, or deeds, which are there reckoned. And though the time of reckoning be far off, yet it is sure. Nothing ever passes away, nothing perishes; the form changes, that is all. The past year, with its sins and its graces, its failures and its successes, its own "dead great" and its own "dead small" changes into a new year; yet we who go to meet the new year carry the past year with us. The form only changes; time is born of time.

The mind is so constituted that scarcely with a great effort can we persuade ourselves that death is as inevitable to us as it is to each new year of our life. And as God has thought fit to so make our minds, I never can see, myself, that it is wise to force a feeling He has, in His wisdom, made well-nigh impossible. But a steadying ballast to life can be found in a feeling more easy and more attainable, and which marks strongly all great and wise characters—a feeling of *responsibility for the present as the outcome of an equally responsible past.* Let that, then, go with us into our new year. The judgment of God is the re-opening of these books of the record of our several years, and the sum of a year, when it is past, is the sum of the days of that year. And the judgment of the dead is the weighing up of those single years and single days of our life which, one by one, looked so insignificant. The past is irrevocable, but it is not done away with.

II. But for us Christians there is quite a different thought possible, such as has never been given to any except Christians, I believe. For you read here not only that "the books" were opened, but that "another book was opened, which is the book of life."

The "books" are the records of your life and mine; but this BOOK of LIFE, this one book, is not such as they. Elsewhere St. John calls it "the Lamb's book of life."

Let the suggestion made by these words be our final thought for the dying year. Friends, if we had to stand, you and I, before the great White Throne, to be judged for life or for death, for reward of good or reward of evil, by this one single year which we are now closing, *dare you face it?* Truth, mark, truth; no glosses, no fanciful excuses, no cunning self-deceptions; pure truth, plain facts, "according to our WORKS." This year has, perhaps, not seen you at your worst; yet, would you be content to stake your trial upon its merits? No? Then on what are you to depend in the great scrutiny of life?

Those who dare to look calmly forward to the last day of the last year of their life, and to the opening of their books, are those, I think, who place least reliance upon their own virtues. They point you to that "other book."

My friends, there is where our strength lies. In the One Book, the Book of Life, there is that which can cancel that very heavy balance lying against us, may be, in the record of this our latest year. In the "other book" we have humbly dared to enter our names as applicants for the compensating charity of God. In the "other book" is inscribed all the riches, and wisdom, and knowledge, and mercy, and power, and righteousness, and truth of Christ. In the "other book" is the record of the Lamb of God; and we have believed that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin."

Nay! we look at the "dead year," and thinking how great was its opportunity, how poor our performance, we are ready to say that for our sins and our shortcomings we are little better than dead too. Then we should despair and be paralysed did we not take thought of the "other book," "the book of life," But we bethink us how it is written: "you, being dead in your sins. . . . . hath He quickened, together with Him; having forgiven you all trespasses; *blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us,* and took it out of the way, nailing it to the Cross."

Thus do we end the old year by seeking in the grace of our Saviour the mercy we need for our past, and we begin the new by seeking, in the life of the same Saviour, the power and the grace needed for the morrow.

A few more years and the day of our life will be passed, our year ended. Life is to be lived *once;* there is no room for experiments and re-trials. The end comes swiftly on the beginning, as men tell us who have reached or are nearing the end. Is it not well then, dear friends, that we should be beforehand with Time? Do not carry on more of the burden of a past year than you need. Let the last day of this year find you with your debts and your sins, your weaknesses and your selfishness and your faithlessness all brought humbly to the Lamb of God, that His love may cure them. Let them be blotted out so far as your guiltiness goes. For God can forgive, though He cannot annihilate the past. The "other book," the "Lamb's book of life," can hold the record of your *faith* as securely and as surely as "the books" hold the record of your *works.*

A CORRESPONDENT in the *Gloucestershire Chronicle* says:—The Rev. W. J. Scott has been instituted by the Bishop of London to the living of St. Saviour's, Sunbury-on-Thames. It will be remembered that, rather more than two years ago, the Bishop of this diocese refused to allow Mr. Scott to continue his ministrations at Prestbury, in consequence of certain doctrinal charges alleged against him, although Mr. Scott and his friends absolutely denied that there was any foundation for two of the charges, and that for the rest, as assistant-priest, he was not solely responsible. Subsequently Mr. Scott was presented to a Crown living in Norfolk, but the refusal of Bishop Ellicott to sign his letters testimonial proved an insuperable difficulty in the way, the Bishop of Norwich having insisted on the production of letters testimonial from the last diocese in which Mr. Scott, although unlicensed, had ministered—viz., Gloucester and Bristol, and having further declined to accept letters testimonial countersigned by the present Evangelical Bishop of Exeter, the last diocese in which Mr. Scott had held a licence. It seemed likely, therefore, that owing to Bishop Ellicott's action, Mr. Scott would find an insuperable obstacle in the way of his institution: but, as we have already stated, Mr. Scott has recently been instituted by the Bishop of London, with all the facts of the case before him.

Certain HARNESS' Cure.
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
FOR
RHEUMATISM
Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh, writes:—"*The Electropathic Belt has* **completely cured** *me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense agony for two years. I now feel strong and active.*"
Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. **Pamphlet & Advice free on application** to **Mr. C. B. Harness,** *Consulting Electrician,* the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
Only Address,
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W. (*Corner of Rathbone Place.*)
Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 11, 1889.

THE NEW CODE.—II.

PASSING from health to disease, we cannot but observe that it seems hard that the Department should take no notice of epidemics except when the school is closed. No allowance is made for the frequent small attendances in consequence of the ailments incidental to childhood, which do so much to lower the average of attendance. This is a drawback over which managers and teachers have no control, but for which nevertheless they are made to suffer. The present *regime* of notices sent by the teacher to the attendance officer, and passed on by him to the delinquent parents—or not, as it may happen—is little better than a farce. Attendance is practically not enforced at all except in those very rare cases where a summons is served. The *system* is at fault. It is ineffective in operation, and tells banefuly upon the unfortunate Voluntary Schools. There ought to be a medical officer to test cases of prolonged absence. It should be for the teacher to report such cases to him, and then, if he ordered the child to be sent to school, a sharp fine should be inflicted where the order was disregarded. The other alteration under this heading is in Article 87, and involves *immediate* compliance with the sanitary authority's order to close the school *before*, instead of subject to an appeal to the Department. This calls for a word of comment. It is undeniably a proper change, because in not a few boards, as well as among managers of Voluntary Schools, there seems to be a dilatory hesitating compliance with the needful sanitary precautions, and in an emergency no time should be lost. Here again, however, occurs that vagueness of wording so conspicuous throughout the Code. The clause might bear interpretation forbidding an appeal against the reasonableness of the injunction until the school has been *reopened*, instead of as soon after closing as may be convenient. "After complying" is too vague, unless it refer to the former sense, which renders the appeal practically valueless. A new departure is contained in Article 88. The managers are ordered to publish a copy of the last school account furnished to the Department, together with the last annual report of Her Majesty's Inspector. It must be taken for granted here, as throughout the Code, that the word "managers," unless the nature of the case forbid it, is to include School Boards, otherwise it would mean a great injustice and intolerance towards the other class of Directors. What, then, is meant here by *publishing*? Not printing surely, or else it would be stated at what price the copies were to be sold, and to whom they were to be supplied. Nor are we told *where* they are to be made public, and in what form. It can hardly mean that copies are to be supplied *gratis* for public distribution. How much mischief this would make! The wording of the reports would be very generally misunderstood by the uninitiated, and the plan would be most unfair to the teachers especially. While it is eminently desirable that the subscribers and those connected with the school should have the accounts placed in their hands, it would produce much friction and annoyance were the parents, and any ignorant or ill-disposed neighbours, to have the opportunity of twitting the schoolmaster or mistress with their being in receipt of "so much a day." The National Union of Teachers (they prefer to strike out the word "Elementary") have made a great deal of the uncertainty of tenure, and the inefficiency of management in the Voluntary Schools. Mr. Girling's paper is largely devoted to giving instances of those who have been dismissed through personal pique and clerical caprice. We are quite prepared to admit that the long string of such wrongful dismissals which were laid before the Union are prejudicial to the interests of Church Schools, for those who have done "yeoman's service" have merited better things from their employers. But the days have gone by in which the schoolmaster was practically dependent upon the clergyman, whose good word was essential before teaching was a recognised profession, at least as far as National Schools went. We cannot sympathise with the clamour now being raised to make the schoolmaster a fixture, and to prevent him from entering on, or being compelled to enter upon, his scholastic agreement in conjunction with extraneous duties, such as Sunday School, organ, choir, etc. When the Department has, so to speak, disestablished the Voluntary Schools by taking upon itself to render it practically impossible for managers to engage a teacher without its consent, and to prohibit his dismissal likewise, it will be no

longer possible for religious instruction to be guaranteed at all. The Denominations have built these schools with the express object of securing religious instruction. It therefore comes to this: Suppose the master or mistress were engaged on the understanding that they would teach in the spirit of that denomination which selected them. Some little time after the teacher becomes either a member of some other Christian body, or an avowed infidel. If the proposed "fixity of tenure" be established he cannot be dismissed, and the chief purpose for which he was engaged, to teach the distinctive tenets of his church, is thwarted, and, unless the school be closed entirely, we might have the spectacle pourtrayed in "Our Work" for this month, namely, "An Infidel Schoolmaster giving Lessons in the Gospel of St. John, and Jewish and Roman Catholics imparting Religious Knowledge which they believed to be Heretical." With free education, or closely following upon it, must come the neutralising of all the Voluntary Schools, unless the same freedom of conscience be extended to Churchmen, by allowing them to have what they pay for, as was conceded to the Non-conformists when they were relieved from paying church rates for what they could not avail themselves of. Why should it be an aspersion upon a schoolmaster who is "efficient, very efficient;" but who does not satisfy his employers in that part of his duty which lies outside his profession? The State does not pay him for this, why then should it interfere? If Mr. Girling would reflect upon the difference in the nature of their respective tenures, he would not ask why the schoolmaster should not be equally permanent with the clergyman. The former is in greater part paid by the State—the latter receives not one farthing therefrom. By all means let us render to Cæsar his own things, but *never* the things of God. We earnestly hope that the period may be extended considerably before this measure becomes the law of the land.

NOT GODLESS PEACE.

WHILST, from time to time, it is expedient for the friends of Peace to exert their influence actively against panic-cries for increased armaments and against administrative waste and extravagance, in connection with the Admiralty or the War Office, yet it is also desirable ever to maintain the pacific testimony on its primary and strongest basis of Christian principle. It is because war is eminently sinful and hateful to God, and productive of all manner of evils to mankind, that it is to be especially opposed, and also because the spirit of conciliation and harmony is essentially pleasing to the Divine Head of the Church.

Doubtless, economical considerations, in regard to the pecuniary interests of the taxpayer, are of importance. But they should always be regarded as subordinate to the claims of Scriptural principle and religious duty. And if the work of disarmament is urged mainly from motives of financial advantage, this is a plea which may also be used, and constantly is so used, in support of increased, or presumptively adequate, defences for the material and commercial interests of nations. If a taxpayer opposes panic-cries exclusively on grounds of economy, he is apt to be met with the reply—"It is precisely as a premium of national insurance that we ask for more ships and soldiers for your own protection. It may be far cheaper in the end for you than if, in consequence of being unprepared for invasion, you lose the bulk, or even the whole of your possessions, both personal and national." Nor is it easy to rebut this plea, whilst regard is chiefly directed to the mere saving of taxation.

But those who oppose the war spirit, and the increase of armaments, principally on the ground of their hatefulness to God and of their essential antagonism to the extension of the Spirit and Kingdom of Christ, occupy a very different and incomparably stronger position.

Nor is peace too habitually to be advocated on account of its pleasantness, its facilities for ease and profit, for undisturbed trading and money-making, on the part of the non-military citizen. Such an advocacy is weak and one-sided. For whenever a condition of national or international peace is taken advantage of, for the most part, to foster habits of luxury and sensuality, the deepest and truest interests of the people are positively injured by such an abuse of pacific blessings. For example, in reference to the condition of the Slave States of America just before the Civil War, who can reasonably believe that the cruelty, the oppression, and the shocking licentiousness which were then, and for a long period previously, universally rampant in those States, were less displeasing, in the Divine sight, than the evils of the four years of the conflict which resulted in putting an absolute end to the Slave system? It would have been a very weak plea to have opposed that particular war chiefly because it would necessarily break in upon the deadly moral torpor and fœtid foulness of the plantation and city life of the Southern States, as they then existed. The horrible vices and crimes of such a social condition were probably in the mind of Dr. W. E. Channing, that pre-eminent American friend of peace, when he declared that "there are some evils even worse than war."

Nor, further, must it be forgotten that, even in war, there are at times to be witnessed genuine heroisms and noble purposes, at least superior to the careers of such persons as pervert the blessings of peace to the service of a godless avarice or sensuality. If this is ignored by any, in the propagation of peace, such persons fairly lay themselves open to the indignant sarcasms of speakers like Lord Wolseley, who, at Birmingham, recently denounced such a weak mode of advocacy as "the

incarnation of pure and calculated selfishness, as unpatriotic as unwise." In the best interests of the holy cause of peace, it is necessary to rest its highest claims and its strongest defence upon a very different basis, even that of allegiance to the spirit and precepts of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, whose emphatic declaration everlastingly abides. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." Such love and such discipleship meet with deadly antagonism, both in the subtle moral pestilence of a merely godless peace and in the more obvious evils, the awful carnage and terrors, of actual warfare. The truest promotion of peace will oppose both forms of evil impartiality—because both are fraught with influences hostile to the allegiance due only to God and to Christ.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Third Sunday after Easter.

We often, like the disciples of old, know what it is, perhaps for years, to be in a kind of spiritual twilight. We, like them of old, cannot discern a clear path through the tangled maze which life seems to present to our eyes. We are, in some measure, amongst those whom our Collect describes as being "in error." Oh! do we not know how bitterly true this has been many times when we have least liked to confess it? And there is just the difficulty; we *must* put ourselves in the lowly position which can own itself in need of help and teaching, and then the precious promise is ours: He will show us the light of His truth! But light is of little value to those who will not use it. If, lighting our candle, we place it under a bushel, what purpose can it serve, unless it be to condemn us for being in the dark? So is it with this greatest light; unless we employ it to the good of our souls, to the "intent that" we "may return into the way of righteousness," and keep in it, we had better never have had it at all. In the last great day, when we shall be called upon to give an account of the use we have made of the privileges which our Father has bestowed, woe will be ours if we have to confess that the Light was given, but we did not heed it; that the path opened clear before us, but we would not walk therein! God forbid that this should be our fate! Let us look to the brighter and nobler side of the picture; let us trust that we may, by God's grace, join so heartily in this prayer that the blessings asked may be ours. And what are these blessings?

1st. "*That we may eschew all those things contrary to the Christian profession.* And surely we can all join earnestly in this! How many things in our past and present life we have done and still do which will not bear this test! What shall we say of unkind, frivolous thoughts? How bear to bring before this searching light, the foolish, hasty, bitter words, of which we often feel so ashamed? And then for the omission of commission of so many deeds, how find any excuse? Truly we shall discover how needful is this prayer. But this is not all. It is not sufficient to expel the enemy; the fortress must be garrisoned by well-tried troops; and this brings us to

2nd. "*That we may follow all things agreeable to our profession.*" The fruits of the Spirit, "Love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance," these must be our aim. Against them is no law. And so shall our prayer be fulfilled in our experience, and God's name be honoured.

Reviews and Notices.

"The Expositor." May, 1889. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

We notice first the Rev. W. W. Peyton's article, "The Bread Problem of the World: our Lord's First Temptation." We have read a great deal of literature on the subject of the Temptation, but we have seldom read a better sermon than Mr. Peyton's. It is exactly the sort of teaching that well meaning, but weak, gushing, sentimental philanthropy of the present day needs. Mr. Peyton sees that what was presented subjectively to our Saviour was the temptation to alleviate the woes of mankind by bettering only the outward conditions of life. Only make stones bread, and then the curse pronounced of old—thorns and thistles (דַּרְדַּר) is literally "spontaneous but useless growths" —thistles is a misleading translation) shall the earth, even the good red plough land, הָאֲדָמָה bring forth; and in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread—and then all shall be right! That was the temptation to one who as Son of God could have done, but because Son of God would not do, what modern philanthropy is incessantly striving to do, viz., feed man, heedless whether or not the mode of doing so forwards or retards that higher life which lives not by bread alone. We thank Mr. Peyton for this paper, and hope he will give us two more on the other Temptations.

Professor Driver's article, called "The Double Text of Jeremiah," is really a criticism of a book by Professor Workman. We have not seen Professor Workman's book, and without having it before us could give no opinion worth recording of Professor Driver's article. We only note that Professor Driver thinks the Masoretic text exhibits Jeremiah's prophecies in a more original form than the text which the LXX. followed.

Professor Ramsay continues his interesting articles on the "Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia," and Professor Bruce his "Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews." We did not find anything in Dr. Lumley's article which we have not read again and again in every commentary, but except this one descent into the common-place, the number is quite equal to the *Expositor's* usual standard of excellence.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

THE MINISTRY OF EVIL.

Sir,—I have no objection whatever to offer to the substitution of the title—"The Ministry of Evil"—for the one I used—"God's Sovereignty." There are certain aspects of the case in which it is quite clear that the object of the existence of evil is that of serving to develop and train the good. This, however, was

not the point under consideration. That point was the evil in conflict with the good. The writer of the sermon contended that men's evil doings could not frustrate God's purpose. The author of the letter argued, as I understood him, that men were constantly rendering His purposes of love and mercy of none effect. This was the point. The "Ministry of Evil" is a side issue.

I have no objection, either, to offer to "J. B.'s" intuitions. If he thinks that such "thoughts" in him do "amount practically to insinuations against the wisdom and benevolence of God," he has every right to dismiss them from his mind. Farther than this he may not go. He may not judge his brother. It would be, I may readily assure him, most repugnant to my feelings to entertain thoughts having any such tendency. I have no sympathy, either, with infidels. It does not help the argument, so far as I can see, even to suggest such things.

"J. B." says that a conviction "flashed across his mind." His experience is in this respect unique. Convictions do not flash across most people's minds. They are either intuitive or the result of a process of reasoning. I think that, in either case, it will be found with most people a conviction is not momentary. Then such a conviction—"All intelligent creation *will become good*" (italics are mine) "through the superior energy of moral good!!" "J. B." will excuse my using a few notes of exclamation.

This involves two positions—I will not call them absurdities, but positions. (1) Evil ministers to the good in the moral being in whom evil is in active operation. (2) Universal reclamation. May I ask "J. B." how he makes them good?

The quotations from his book are, if he will allow me to say so, *nihil ad rem*. They only prove, what most orthodox Christians readily admit, that "through much tribulation we enter the kingdom." They are no solution of the difficulty, in the abstract, that evil exists.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, May 4th, 1889.

MR. DIXON'S SERMON.

SIR,—Had it not been for the invitation which Mr. Dixon has given in his letter of the 27th April that I should reply to him, I doubt whether I would have taken any further notice of the passage in his sermon upon which I animadverted in my letter of the 13th. As a rule I avoid theological discussions; they are rarely satisfactory because rarely conclusive, being in most cases mere matter of opinion. And had it not been for the glaring inconsistency in the passage referred to in my letter with the past history of the human family and our every day experience, I should have allowed it to pass.

Permit me, however, to refer to the letters of two of your correspondents, Mr. Sandlands and Mr. "B." Mr. Sandlands wishes me to remember that God is a Sovereign and Omnipotent. I acknowledge His Sovereignty, and within certain limits I say it reverently, His Omnipotence; but he proceeds to argue that if these be conceded, "the will of men and devils cannot contravene His will." Upon this we differ. I contend they have always contravened His will and are doing so daily; that is to say, the Will of God as revealed in His Word. "Thou shalt not steal." Is that the will of God? Do men steal? "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Do men commit adultery? "Thou shalt not bear false witness." Do men bear false witness? Why say, then, that God's will is not contravened? But your correspondent "B." suggests that I should have substituted the word "defeat" for "clash" in the passage I quoted from Mr. Dixon. Pray why? What right had I to assume that Mr. Dixon was wrong in the words he employed to convey his meaning? Had he used the word defeat—although I would not have quite agreed with his statement even with that substitution — it is probable you would not have been troubled with this correspondence. But Mr. Dixon himself does not repudiate the word. He adopts it fully in his last letter. Now what does this word *clash* mean? It means "to oppose, to conflict with, to interfere with." Mr. Dixon's contention is that God never allows the wills or machinations of men or devils to oppose, conflict with, or interfere with His divine purposes; and it is to this dogmatic statement that I have taken exception, and in doing so I pointed out the fall of man. Surely there was a clashing with His Divine purpose in this event, else why the cry "Cursed be the ground for thy sake." I also instanced the *flood*. Was there not a clashing with His Divine purpose by men before this calamity came upon them? Else what is the meaning of this, "and it repented the Lord that He had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart." I also instanced the forty years' wandering in the wilderness. Now, with regard to this, we know how the fulfilment of God's purpose was delayed and interfered with by the "rebellious" and "stiff-necked" people, and by Moses himself, so that terrible punishments befell the former, and the latter was not permitted to enter the promised land. How can you say, then, that there is no clashing with God's divine purposes, else what character would you give Him?

Is it necessary to multiply illustrations? The Bible is full of them. The history of the chosen people is a history of clashings with divine purposes. And all along the ages what else do we witness? I confess to you I cannot reconcile my idea of God as a loving Father, omnipotent and omniscient, with many events in the history of mankind that are recorded in books sacred and profane, except upon the principle that evil is also omnipotent, and man's freedom of will is an endowment so sacred that neither power dare curb or coerce it, hence his tremendous responsibility in the economy of God. He is a being made "a little lower than the angels, and crowned with glory and honour." He may become the embodiment of all that is good or of all that is evil, just as he is influenced by these contending powers, and yields to the one or the other.

Mr. Dixon supports his theory by certain quotations. I disregard the quotations, even though they are illustrated by hypothetical cases. Both the illustrations and arguments are responsible for the error into which I contend Mr. Dixon has fallen, for example, in reply to their illustrations God says "Thou shalt not covet," Man says "I shall." Who prevails, God or man? In every case man may carry out his own will against the express will, command, or purpose of God. It is true he is punished for it here or hereafter, but though God had the power to check him, He does not, nor would He exercise His power in the case of the young man Mr. Dixon cites who is supposed to be bent on committing a robbery. He would no doubt warn him, as He does every intending sinner, but if the sinner will he may commit the deed in opposition to this warn

ng, risking the consequences, and God will not prevent him. And this is what I call clashing with God's divine purposes, for it must be assumed that the Ten Commandments are as much the express Will of God to-day as they were when given to Moses, else why do Mr. Dixon and his clerical brethren read them out every Sabbath? And being His Will, does it not follow that it is His purpose they should be obeyed? I contend, therefore, that Mr. Dixon and all who agree with him, must be blind not to see that from the days of Adam to the present time there has been a perpetual war going on—a clashing between good and evil, between God and the devil; and I fear this clashing will continue until that happy consummation arrives, when, we are told, "the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ."

JOHN A. WALKER.

Dublin.

BURIAL REFORM ASSOCIATION.—The Lord Mayor of London presided on Friday in the Mansion House, London, at the eleventh annual meeting of the Church of England Burial, Funeral, and Mourning Reform Association. Among those who had expressed their general approval of the objects of the Society and regretted their inability to be present were the Duke of Wellington, the Earl of Aberdeen, the Earl of Dartmouth, Earl Fortescue, Earl Rosebery, the Bishops of Bath and Wells, Gloucester and Bristol, Leicester, and Bedford, Lord Charles Beresford, Lord Randolph Churchill, the Right Hon. Sir Lyon Playfair, M.P., Gen. Sir Alex. Gordon, Bart., Gen. Sir G. H. Willis, the Deans of Lichfield, St. Paul's, and Windsor, the Archdeacon of London, Dr. B. W. Richardson, Dr. Cameron, M.P., Dr. Haward, Mr. Seymour Haden, Col. Sackville West, and Miss Davenport Hill. The Lord Mayor said that he was entirely opposed to the present system of funerals, the expenses of which ought to be reduced in all classes of society. The Lord Bishop of London in moving, "it is desirable that all persons interested in the encouragement of sanitation, temperance, and thrift should give their moral and practical support to the Church of England Burial Reform Association," said that burial in the simple earth in suitable soil with as little as possible to retard the action of the air and earth in the disintegration of the mortal remains was becoming every day more necessary. Canon Barker, in seconding the motion, deprecated excessive floral decoration. Canon Erskine Clarke moved that "it is desirable that 'earth to earth' burial be encouraged on grounds religious, sanitary, and economic, and that burial in durable coffins and vaults be discouraged." Mr. Wollaston Pym, in seconding the resolution, complained of the overcrowding of the Brompton Cemetery to the public health. Dr. Danford Thomas proposed that "fresh legislation" was necessary, whereby, (*a*) the authority over burial places now divided between the Home Office and the Local Government Board be concentrated in one or the other, and that all new cemeteries be under the control of that one public authority. (*b.*) Exclusive and perpetual rights in the soil of burial places be not permitted. (*c.*) Overcrowding of the dead be made a legal offence liable to a penalty on summary conviction before the magistrates; and, (*d.*) The land selected for new cemeteries be certified as suitable for the dissolution of human remains before it be so used. The Rev. G. A. M. How, Vicar of Bromley, and Rural Dean, seconded the resolution. A vote of thanks to the Lord Mayor was moved by the Rev. W. Benham, Rector of St. Edmund, Lombard St., and seconded by Mr. Coverley, who called attention to the excessive overcrowding in one London cemetery, sometimes extending to from 70 to 80 children's bodies being buried in one pit.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Badger, Rev. William Collins, M.A., Rector of Bressingham, Norfolk.
Beevor, Rev. J. H., Rector of Hevingham, Norfolk.
Carnegie, Rev. W. H., Rector of Great Witley, Worcestershire.
Custance, Rev. Charles William Neville, M.A., Rector of Ashill, Norfolk.
Gibbons, Rev. T. G., M.A., Vicar of Halstead, Essex; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Gloucestershire.
Hitchcock, Rev. Robert Aldous, Curate of Beccles; Rector of St. Bartholomew's, Heigham, Norwich.
Howard, Rev. Alfred, Rector of Harford, near Ivybridge.
Hutton, Rev. E. A., Curate of Mottram; Incumbent of St. Magdalene's, Broadbottom.
Maclure, Rev. Canon, M.A., Vicar end Rural Dean of Rochdale; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Lancashire.
Napier, Rev. Frederick Parker, B.A., Senior Curate of Forton; Rector of Emsworth, Hants.
Nash, Rev. F. L., M.A., Curate of Hambleden; Vicar of Lane End, Bucks.
Pelly, Rev. Raymond P., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Stratford; Vicar of Saffron Walden, Essex.
Pownall, Rev. Edward Waterhouse, M.A., Curate of St. George's, Hanover Square; Vicar of St. John-the-Evangelist, Drury Lane.
Rivington, Rev. Theodore, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Clifton Hampden; Vicar of Aston Rowant, Tetsworth.
Rose, Rev. William Francis, M.A., Rector of Ewelme, Oxfordshire.
Spurgin, Rev. J. F., Vicar of Great and Little Hockham, Norfolk.
Upcher, Rev. James Hay, M.A., Rector of Sculthorpe, Norfolk.
Victor, Rev. Henry Ernest, Chaplain to St. Anne's School, Abbots, Rugeley.
Were, Rev. Canon, of Nottingham; Vicar of St. Werburgh's, Derby.
Whitaker, Rev. George Herbert, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, Honorary Canon of Truro, and Head of the Divinity School; Residentiary Canon in Hereford Cathedral.
Whitworth, Rev. Thomas John, B.A., Vicar of Thorpe St. Peter, Lincolnshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brame, Rev. John, Rector of St. Peter's, Manchester, at the Rectory, 5, Irwell View, Old Trafford, on the 28th ult., in his 73rd year.
Gidley, Rev. Louis, formerly of Honiton, and late Chaplain of St. Nicholas Hospital, Salisbury, at Salisbury, on the 28th ult., aged 67.
Maming, Rev. Naason, for thirty-one years Vicar of Hooe, at the Vicarage, Hooe, Sussex, on the 3rd inst., aged 80.
Poole, Rev. George, B.A., formerly (for thirty-four years) Vicar of Burntwood, at Hammerwich, near Lichfield, on the 1st inst., aged 82.
Raynor, Rev. George, B.A., Rector of Hazleigh, at Hazleigh Rectory, on the 3rd inst., aged 69.
Simcox, Rev. William Henry, at Harlaxton Rectory, on the 4th inst., aged 46.
Surtees, Rev. Scott Frederick, of No. 1, Gloucester Terrace, Hyde Park, and of the Manor House, Dimsdale-on-Tees, at Bristol, on the 1st inst., aged 75.
Walker, Rev. Augustine Harley, Rector of King's Kerswell, in London, suddenly, on the 6th inst., aged 43.
Wood, Rev. James, M.A., Prebendary of Wells, and forty-three years incumbent of Christ Church, Bath, at 19, Somerset Place, Bath, on the 27th ult., aged 76.

The Church of England Pulpit.

PEACE—ITS HELPS AND HINDRANCES.

By the Rev. A. WYNDHAM CLAMPETT, M.A.

A Farewell Sermon Preached in S. Saviour's Church, Herne Hill Road, Camberwell, on Sunday Morning, April 14th, 1889.

"And the peace of God which passeth all understanding shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus."—Philippians iv. 7.

COUNTLESS are the ways by which peace is sought. Amid the restlessness of this fevered life there is a passionate craving for peace, for rest. In this world we seem oftentimes to be tossed about in a dark dream of exciting existence. We are not satisfied with ourselves, and would vent our dissatisfaction upon God and the circumstances in which He hath placed us. We are ever wanting something new, but the satisfying toy never comes. There is an unfulfilled desire in every breast, and there is no pleasure without its touch of alloy. Given the whole world, there would still be something to wish for, and cause us to weep like the all-conquering monarch of old, who, having won all places wept, because there were no more countries to conquer. God never meant us to be perfectly happy, perfectly at rest here.

Restfulness and peace are two of the joys of heaven. Here we have to be disciplined before we enter upon the full peace there. Now we notice peace hath its antecedents. We find the jailer in the Gospel narrative trembling before we find him rejoicing. There were mighty rushing winds, earthquakes and fire from heaven, before there came to Elijah the "still small voice" in which God was. So now, as then, God prepares the way by thunders and earthquakes, by making consciences tremble, by afflictions and pains, by many smarts and pangs, before He comes to us in the sweet voice of peace and comfort. Yet is there not oftentimes a deep peace where the surface has signs of restlessness only? Yes. You know that the ocean is lashed into fury and tumultuous waves by the raging hurricane, but 'tis all on the surface. Deep down the waters are still as a summer's eve, with no ripple, breath, or disturbing motion. And so, my brethren, if we had the faith we ought, there would be within us, amid the dreary noises of the world, amid its cares and burning tears, amid its hot contentions, ambitions and disappointments, an inner calm like that of the serene ocean depths. How, then, can this peace be attained? Let us with sanctified minds see what answers we can give to this fair and natural question. May God Almighty direct our thoughts, may He sanctify to our good and pleasure of memory this sacred hour in which we are yet once again met together. Who knows if ever we shall all thus meet again. 'Tis probable, brethren, we never shall. The movements and changes of life necessitate separations. If the present occasion then have something of a special nature about it, let us use it as an opportunity granted by God, an occasion given by Him which He desires us to improve.

Now as to the answers to the question we have suggested. How can this peace of which the text speaks be obtained?

The world (using this expression to denote that part of it over which Satan rules) and Christ Jesus offer us peace. Alas, we are always placed in a difficulty.

We ever find two roads and know not which of the two is the better one to follow. "Shall I do this, or shall I do that;" is not this one of the common dilemmas of life? And so in the pursuit of peace there are two courses open to us. The world's peace consists in giving the rein to desires; Christ's peace consists in mastering those desires. Christ's method places the whole soul under the discipline of the cross, and brings every thought into subjection to the obedience of Christ. Here, then, are our two hopes of rest and peace. "The world's peace comes by adding fuel to the fever, Christ's peace comes by curing the fever." There is not one in this congregation this morning who does not hope to find, in his own way, the peace his spirit needs. Through the path of vice or virtue it is the same pursuit. Seek on and on, you and I, my brethren, ever must, till we win or miss, gain or lose, for ever. One reason, my friends, why men pass through life fretful and dissatisfied, is that they have formed too great an estimate of self, and so think that neither God nor man treats them as they deserve.

The admiration of self makes man wretched. 'Tis desire for praise which enables the sneer of contempt to hurt and wound us. "At the foot of the cross," says one, "there is no room for pride. The cross tells us we are not claimants for reward, but suppliants for life." When, my brethren, we have passed through the first humbling smart of the conviction, that before God we of ourselves are nothing, we have made one step towards the attainment of the peace of God. Then all that burning seething tumult with which our proud bosoms throbbed over fancied slights and imaginary injuries will be at rest. When first the humility of the Gospel possesses our souls, it is the dawn of a morning which goes on to an everlasting day of calmness and serenity. Another cause of restlessness is uncertainty as to our future destiny. Every day brings eternity nearer, and in the prospect of

that time there can be no peace, no rest, unless we have something more than a "perhaps," a guess that God is loving us.

One step for acquiring peace is the attainment of the spirit of obedience — I mean active obedience. There is an eternal law that man cannot be happy except in keeping God's commandments. Men sometimes sit down and look into themselves as if the one great question to answer was, "Am I saved?" 'Tis not so. Make a man sure of heaven, and leave him with a soul not reduced to humility, purity, obedience, and he is a wretched man still. Fulfilment of duty is essential. There is a maddening sensation which flows from the feeling of uselessness, there is something almost amounting to torture in the start with which we sometimes awake to the conviction that life is gliding fast away, and nothing done. There is a gnawing, self-reproach that comes from duties unfulfilled, there is restlessness in the head and breast of the "do-nothing" man, and a torture in the last hours of that man, who may be pointed at as an example of a wasted life. My brethren, I would exhort you in language of power were I able, I would speak as a brother to brethren of mine own age here to-day and say never shirk, never neglect duty. Were I to fade from your memories ere to-morrow's sun had set, were every word I have ever spoken from this pulpit forgotten as a dream, and washed from your memories as the incoming tide washes out the writing on the sand, were I never to speak to you as your minister again, were I convicted of faults and failings without number, yet would I rejoice to the end of my days, be they long or short, if the Almighty would grant power to my words, to make you, yea, make myself also, more loyal to the inspiration of duty, more steadfast in fulfilling its demands.

Every one of us knows our duty. God could not have made it plainer had He emblazoned its laws upon the canopy of heaven. We all know how we ought to walk, how we ought to please God. A thousand voices teach us our duty. History, biography, conscience, experience, all teach and show us the law of duty. Have any of them taught you it is your duty to love and honour God? have they taught you it is your duty to come together here or elsewhere for the worship of the sanctuary? They have. Then never flinch in your fulfilment.

Let no voice ever drown the voice of duty. Let it be a firm principle within, a conviction, not an emotion, not a conventionality. Let it be a rock upon which you place your foot with determination, and then, whether the winds of difficulty or temptation beat about you, you will find yourself chained to the rock of duty, and, like the hardy fir upon the mountain top, you can bid defiance to the fiercest of the elements. There comes of duty all that is noblest and best in this world. It was duty that made the ruddy shepherd lad face the champion giant of the Philistine host. It was duty that made Elijah brave the raging idolatress, and John the idolatrous king. Was it not duty which made the young boys of the "Goliath," though they were but the waifs and strays of our cities, hold their little boat fast beside the burning ship till fire fell on them in flames, and the chains burnt the hand which touched them? And was it not duty which made one little fellow of fourteen, when a few of the weaker ones wanted to push off before the boat was full, shout out that he would knock down the first boy that dared to stir? And thus, though he was but a little workhouse lad, he has set an example to all the boys, aye, to all the men and women of England.

God, my brethren, has closely linked obedience and peace together. God's law written on the heart and carried out in daily life makes you happy, gives you peace.

There is one class which cannot get rest. "The wicked are like the troubled sea, they cannot rest." The vast oceans are never still, the wicked know nothing of rest. And, oh, when God put man in possession of a self, and made that self immortal, He made man master of the tremendous heritage of peace or woe.

Think not man can get peace from his surroundings. A man who has not peace within cannot get it from his circumstances. Can you keep the ocean from the wind? Can you bid the hurricane be still, and not play its wild game over the face of the waters? No! No more can you bid a man be happy because of his circumstances. Place the ungodly man where you will, he still has an unquiet heart within, which ever surges to and fro. But to the wicked God promises peace in those words of the Prophet Isaiah, "Peace, peace to him that is afar off," that is to the wicked. Let the ungodly man, however tossed about he may be, but cry from the depths of his heart, "Lord, save me," let him, amid the storms of life, open the ear of faith, and at once the Divine voice will be heard saying, "Peace, it is I, be not afraid." "Peace hath her victories," Milton tells us, "no less than war." I would to God She would make some conquests to-day. I cannot keep you longer. I would like to persuade you but once again to choose the way of holiness. If you have sinned, if your past life has been a bad one, if I speak to any whose early years were those of immorality, or of some other kind of intemperance, let me say it may now be the eleventh hour for you, the evening of your day may now be closing in, if so, there is no time to be lost; trust now in the cross of Christ for pardon, and then look to Christ for strength. God loves the penitent, may He love us all, because we are and have been penitents at Jesus' feet.

And now, brethren, it remains for me with these my last words to you from this place to bid you farewell. I dare not trust myself to say much.

During the four years and four months we have been together, I have had many opportunities of knowing you and learning something of your good feeling and sympathy. Some of you I have known in trouble and deep sorrow, and again, some of you have known me in sorrow and in grief of a painful kind. I am grateful to you for the refined sympathy I at such a time received. Let the memory of our sorrows sweeten and cement our friendship, brethren. In a short time memory will be the only link between us. God grant it may ever be a pleasant one.

By-and-bye some other voice will address you from this place, it will be but to proclaim the same message of the pardon and love of God; but whether it be my voice or the voice of another, remember it is God alone who can give the increase. In a higher and nobler building we shall one day meet again, but until that time comes, I ask to be remembered in your private and public prayers. I was touched to the heart the other day at hearing of two little children, who, untold by their parents and whilst saying the evening prayer at the mother's knee, and knowing that I was going to a distant colony, asked God to protect and bless me. Such prayers are heard in heaven.

Farewell, dear brethren, may God Almighty bless you all for His dear Son's sake, and bring us, when the pilgrimage of our lives is o'er, to the home above, the home of rest and perfect peace. Oh, what thoughts cluster round the idea of re-union in the Father's home! Oh, friends, this is a noble heritage, a crown worth striving for and bidding to-day our good byes; let us for the last time join in the words of the well-known prayer:—

"Renew our wills from day to day,
Blend them with Thine and take away,
All that now makes it hard to say
Thy will be done.

"Then when on earth we breathe no more
The prayers oft mixed with tears before,
We'll sing upon a happier shore
Thy will be done."

THE TWOFOLD TEST OF RELIGIOUS TRUTH.

A SERMON BY THE REV. HAMILTON STUART VERSCHOYLE, M.A.

"By manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God."—2 COR. iv. 2.
"Bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."—2 COR. x. 5.

IT is almost a truism to say that Rationalism, taking the word in its widest sense, is one of the chief dangers to religion at the present day, and as such to be carefully guarded against. This being so, it is important that we should clearly answer to ourselves the question, What is Rationalism, what is its root error? and the further question, Does this root error ever affect our own methods of regarding theological questions?

I suppose all Christians will agree that the root error of Rationalism is (to quote the expression of a famous living preacher) the undue exaltation of intellect in matters of religion.

But this definition requires some examination before it can satisfy us. We require to know over what is exalted, so that the exaltation may become undue. We cannot speak of the exaltation of the intellect above anything coming to us from without, the two are not fairly commensurable, for what comes from without must enter under the forms of the intellect, and so the intellect would be present in both terms of the comparison. To make such a comparison were to compare the witness with that to which he bears witness. I think the only sense in which an undue exaltation of the intellect can be spoken of is its exaltation above some other faculty of the human mind. The intellect declares itself the superior of the senses, which, without its formative activity, are meaningless, and of the feelings, which, independently of it, cease to be when they cease to be felt, and thus the intellect, or the understanding, cannot be *unduly* exalted above the senses or the feelings. But there is one faculty—"a faculty," as Bishop Butler says, "in kind and in nature, supreme over all others, and which bears its own authority of being so"—the faculty of conscience. Any exaltation of the Intellect, or rather let me say of the Understanding (for the Reason, which bears witness to necessary truth as distinguished from contingent truth, may be said to form with the Conscience one spiritual faculty), any exaltation of the Understanding above the Conscience must be an undue exaltation.

I think we must all agree that not a few scientific men from a habit of relying, and relying rightly, on the understanding in natural science as the faculty through which the data of the senses are given and by which they are reasoned upon, and from regard-it rightly as the final court of appeal in such matters, have been led to regard it as also the final court of appeal in religion, and to look upon every alleged truth, which cannot be arrived by the senses and the Understanding as something which cannot be known. Hence the contempt for Metaphysics and Theology, which treat of truths testified to by Reason and Conscience.

In thus neglecting the testimony of Conscience in matters of religion or subordinating it to that of the Understanding, Rationalists are not merely neglecting or subordinating the testimony of a co-ordinate witness, but that of one which, as we have seen, claims to be supreme, which, secondly, has to say directly to religion while the Understanding has only to say indirectly, and which, thirdly, when it clearly speaks, gives absolute certainty, while the Understanding can only give at most high probability.

We know that Rationalists do advance moral objections against Christianity, but these will be found to be objections, not against the essence of Christianity, but against matters which have somehow become associated with it, or against theories which men have at different times added to its teachings. And so far we must feel thankful to Rationalists. But their objections to Christianity itself are grounded on the Understanding and arise from a neglect of the testimony of that very faculty whose testimony they have relied on in the just mentioned objections to different excrescences on Christianity.

Time would not allow of entering into details. Suffice it to allude to the theories that Immortality is a fond dream, that there is no such thing as freedom, and so no such thing as sin or as holiness, that the supernatural is impossible, that God is unknown and unknowable. Now, to answer such objections, is it sufficient to appeal to the testimony of the letter of Scripture, or to the testimony of the Church and to the historical evidences for the trustworthiness of either? No; for we thus remain merely on the level of the Understanding. If we take the true ground, then the way is opened for such arguments as supplementary; but we must first, as S. Paul did, appeal to the Conscience "by manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God."

On the mere level of the Understanding immortality is incredible; but if we appeal to the testimony of Conscience we find that the same voice, which commands us to follow holiness, tells us that holiness contains as an essential element the advance in holiness, and the effort after such advance, and so were a time ever to come when a holy man's existence were to cease, his holiness would lack an essential element, and that when it had reached the highest point yet attained, which were a contradiction. Thus holiness implies the scope for endless development and so immortality. On the level of the Understanding freedom is impossible, but in Conscience it is given to us in the moral imperative "I ought"—"I ought, therefore I can."

On the level of the Understanding the supernatural is impossible, but in the Conscience it is given to us in a twofold manner—first given to us in that supernatural voice which we hear there, and then given in the fact of freedom which constitutes us supernatural beings, that is, beings acting on the line of physical cause and effect in nature from outside that line. Freedom, which is given to us in Conscience, extends beyond the moral to a limited application to the physical sphere.

I know that the assertion that our voluntary action upon material nature, as *e.g.*, in the throwing of a stone, is the exercise of a higher power has been objected to, among others by Professor Schmidt of Strasburg, who asks, "If the stone weighs two hundredweight, where is the higher power then?" and seems to think that this settles the point. Did the *odium antitheologicum* so influence the Professor that he forgot his elementary mechanics, that he forgot that the stone weighed, while subject to his upward pull, would weigh less than the two hundred-weight by the amount of his pull? But this in passing. On the level of the Understanding God is unknown, for the Understanding only gives us phenomena, and from phenomenal effects it can only reason to a phenomenal cause, and so not to God. But when appeal is made to Reason and Conscience He is no longer unknown. Reason recognises Him as the ground, the implication of all our thinking, as "the light of all our seeing"; while Conscience hears His voice commanding there, rebuking, encouraging, urging to holiness.

The ignoring or subordinating of the testimony of Conscience being then the root error of Rationalism, let us ask ourselves if this root error may ever affect our methods of approaching theological questions. How do we ourselves accept or hold various theological theories, whether true or false? how in many theological writings is it sought to establish such theories? Is it not often by an appeal to the voice of the Church or the letter of Scripture and an induction thereon grounded, and this sometimes without applying the test of conscience, and sometimes (and in this case the doctrine must be false) in opposition to its testimony? But is not this the very root error of Rationalism? Is it not ignoring the testimony of Conscience or subordinating it to that of the Understanding? For an induction of Scripture and a conclusion thus drawn is a work of the Understanding, and its validity reposes on the authority of the Understanding.

To take one instance—a theory which is, I suppose, now held by few—the theory of Reprobation, what is it but a Rationalistic theory?

Surely now, if ever, it is incumbent on every friend of religion to remember that whatever claims to be religious truth must commend itself to the Conscience; for otherwise we help forward the cause of Rationalism and Infidelity by helping to give currency to that root error the subordination of the Conscience to the Understanding; secondly, we help to weaken the cause of Christianity by associating with its eternal truths doctrines of men which are opposed to Conscience, and which must so be eventually overthrown, thus "putting a stumbling-block and an occasion to fall in our brother's way"; and, thirdly, we help forward the cause of those who, however unwittingly, are working towards the sapping of the foundations of absolute morality and the abolishment of the eternal distinction between right and wrong.

I think this question is of great importance, for not unfrequently truly religious people think themselves bound to accept theories against which their conscience protests, because they think that in so doing they are submitting their Conscience to the

Word of God, whereas what they are doing is submitting the testimony of their Conscience to the testimony of their Understandings as to what is the Word of God and as to what Scripture means, and, we may add, putting the exercise of their spirits—faith—below the exercise of their Understanding. Our faith in our Father should oblige us to reject some teachings about Him by whatever external evidence they may be supported.

It is objected that we can only judge of the external evidences for the trustworthiness of teaching about God, but that we cannot judge of its matter, because the finite cannot grasp the infinite. But, as God has told us by the mouth of His prophet, "as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts"—words which, if they have any meaning, must mean that God's ways and thoughts are commensurable with ours, different not in kind but in degree, otherwise what would be the meaning of their being "higher"? As has been well said, "it is by what is highest in ourselves that we rise to the most highest."

A more plausible objection is, that Conscience being defiled by sin no reliance can be placed on its testimony. But if this were so, then no reliance could be placed upon the testimony of the Bible. For why do we believe what the Bible teaches us? Either because it commends itself to our Conscience as true and so as God's teaching, or because from other sources we believe it to be God's Word. Even in this latter case, if the validity of Conscience is denied we are without ground of belief.

For why do we believe what God teaches us? because we believe He is truthful; and why this? We cannot ground our answer on the Bible, for that were to reason in a circle; we must ground it on the testimony of Conscience. As it has been well expressed by a most able writer, Mr. Murphy, in his "Scientific Bases of Faith"—"We have the same reason to trust the testimony of Conscience to the holiness and love of God as we have to trust its testimony to His truthfulness."

Still, this objection contains an element of truth, for Conscience is injuriously affected by our sinful state and by acts of sin. Let us, then, examine into the nature of Conscience and endeavour to see where this perversion lies, and whether it is such as to invalidate the testimony of Conscience.

In the first place we must notice in what direction this perversion acts—it is not towards making a right act seem wrong in itself, but towards making a wrong act or principle seem right or less wrong than it is. Defilement of Conscience may lead a man to regard the right act of punishing sin to be wrong, but its action is more direct and usual in the opposite direction of failure to appreciate the full wrongness of an act or principle, and so I think the defilement of our Conscience justifies us in arguing thus—If any act or principle is revolting to my defiled Conscience, much more must it be contrary to the character of the pure and Holy God.

Conscience is a knowing and a commanding faculty. It is with its first aspect we have to do here. As a knowing faculty it seems to contain three elements: a moral sense by which we apprehend the qualities of actions, thoughts and principles, a moral reason by which we apprehend the Eternal Good, and a moral judgment by which we compare the qualities of actions, thoughts, and principles, with the Eternal Good. But if we look more closely, we shall find that what we constantly compare these with is not the Eternal Good, but some code of rules—a moral schema, so to speak. These rules ought to be a pure reflection of the Eternal Good, but through sin they are not so. Hence false conventional morality which reaches its climax in "calling evil good and good evil."

By the habit of using these imperfect tests, we make it more and more difficult to gaze on the Eternal Good, and so the moral reason becomes dimmed, the moral sense too becomes dulled.

There being then this warping of Conscience through sin, as well as the defilement of the affections and the will, God has provided a remedy for the former, the same which He has provided for the latter—His self-manifestation, the Incarnate Christ. He clears the moral reason and corrects the moral rules. The life of Christ presents us with the perfect moral rule, as being the perfect realisation in time of the Eternal Idea of the Good. Throughout His whole life, culminating in His sufferings and death, this idea shines with noontide splendour, shining into the dimmest moral reason if that but turn towards it, and thus clearing and strengthening it. In Jesus Christ is the perfect manifestation of moral truth, that is, of holiness, because He is "the Truth"; because He is God, "the Eternal Life manifested." And so St. Paul writing to the Ephesians about morality, says "there is truth (reality) in Jesus;" and here in the second verse I read to you, he points to Him as the text of truth, to which all other evidence must yield, "bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ." But the Incarnate Christ not only indirectly enables us to judge teachings concerning the character of God by clearing and enlightening the conscience, but He also does so directly, because, being One with the Father, He is the perfect manifestation of the Father's character. Here, then, we come to the highest form of interpretation of all that is taught by the Church and of all that is written in Scripture, including the sayings recorded of our Lord. If then any interpretation conflict with the Spirit of Christ, with the manifestation of God in Him, then, however probable it may appear, judged by the evidence of the understanding, we must reject it. There must be a mistake somewhere, in interpretation, in translation, in reading, or in the original report or writing. Let us bring to this test every

theological theory which comes before us, or which we may hold, and if it conflicts with the Spirit of Christ, the perfect Revelation of God, it must be rejected. However strong may be Church testimony, however strong may be the apparent evidence from the letter of Scripture, however our understandings exercised upon Scripture may lead us to regard it as true, however by a comparison of thoughts derived from various passages and the exercise of thought upon them, we may seem to have reached the supposed theory as an irrefragable truth, we must, if it conflict with the Spirit of Christ, "bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ," and reject it.

In thus appealing to conscience as test and to Christ as test, the apostle does not set before us two different tests, but two which are one in their root. He who "came a light into the world" was before His Incarnation, and is ever in the world, not only as the supporter of its existence, but as its Light—"the true light which lighteth every man." The true testimony of conscience is one with the testimony of Christ. What we learn from Scripture of the nature of conscience is what it points to itself. It declares itself to be a voice which is in us but not of us, that is from above us. And the more we apprehend the Lord Jesus, the more shall we apprehend the true nature of conscience, and the more shall we apprehend Him as a light within us. Thus though the Incarnation affords an external norm for judging, it is yet a norm which tends to become ever more and more inward.

This is the true method of spiritual interpretation, spiritual apprehension, of Scripture, interpreting it, apprehending it, in the light of Christ. For the Spirit works by manifestation of Christ in accordance with what He said: "He shall testify of Me." "He shall take of Mine, and shall show it unto you."

But some may object that we are driven in the last resort to the understanding for the ultimate means of judging religious truths, "for how," they may say, "do we receive the life of Christ, but on the authority of the Bible or the Church." But this objection will not hold, for though it is *by means* of the testimony of the Bible and the Church we receive the Gospel, yet it is not *on their authority* The life of Christ, the Incarnate, shines by its own light, proves itself to be real, impossible to have been imagined or invented, and, being real, commends itself to our conscience as the very Life of God on earth, raising up and still surpassing our highest ideal, and answering to the very deepest needs of our spirits. Thus while we render hearty thanks to God for "the Church which is the pillar and stay of the truth," holding up the truth that it may be seen and believed in, and for the Holy Scriptures, all of which "testify of Christ," and to whose testimony, together with that of the Church, we owe it that the Incarnate Christ is set before us to be believed in, yet it is He Himself alone who is the "One foundation" other than which no man can lay.

And let it not be said that we would unduly exalt conscience and render revelation unnecessary. When we look on the world outside the Christian revelation, we see how little, alas, conscience can discover for itself of truth; but when the truth is revealed it is by conscience it is apprehended, more especially by conscience enlightened, and it is only so far as it is thus apprehended, that is for us a revelation or the removal of a veil.

It may strike some of you that this is not a suitable sermon for the Lenten season. I venture to think that it is; for what is the great message of Lent but the call to repentance—to change of mind? And it is "the goodness of God which leadeth (us) to repentance," the Lord Jesus was raised up not only "to give remission of sins," but "to give repentance." God is He "whom to know is life eternal;" it is in the knowledge of God tha the light comes to us which leads us to change from the life of sin and selfishness to a partaking of the life of God, of the eternal life. It is no mere speculative matter which is in question when we consider the tests of religious truth, but the all-important matter: Who is the God in whom we are to believe, to trust? Is He some mere weakly good-natured Being who will shrink from punishing His creatures; or, on the other hand, a Being who will some day finally forsake some of His creatures, and cease to seek to bring them to righteousness; or is He a Father who, because He truly loves His children, will spare them no chastisement, here or hereafter, which He sees to be needful to waken them from the sleep of sin and self, and bring them to take the first step to return to Him? Our Father who will never forsake one of His children, but will, as He has revealed Himself in Christ Jesus, go after the lost sheep "until He find it," Who, being the all-holy One, will never cease to seek to make all partakers of His holiness.

Without the revelation of His spotless holiness and His infinite love we might perhaps be convinced of actions and thoughts contrary to the letter of His law; but that revelation has a power above all other power, to convince of the utter sinfulness of life lived to self instead of lived to God. O let us look upon Him revealed in Christ crucified, and in that revelation we shall find the power to lead us to repentance, to change of mind, to turn us from the darkness of sin to the light of His holiness, from our own selfishness and unlovingness to His righteousness and love.

It has been determined to present a pastoral staff to the diocese of Llandaff before the Church Congress, which is to be held at Cardiff this year. A committee has been formed to obtain subscriptions, and to get the work carried out. The design of Messrs. Kempson and Fowler, of Llandaff, has been selected.

"THE WHOLE IS GREATER THAN ITS PART."

By the Rev. R. C. NUGENT KELLY, M.A.,
English Chaplain at Gothenburg.

Sermon Preached at Gothenburg, on November 25th, 1888.

"When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away."—1 Cor. xiii. 10.

ONE of the first things a lad learns when he begins mathematics is the axiom of Euclid, which sets forth the incontrovertible truth that "the whole is greater than its part." Yes, friends; that is a truth and a not unimportant truth. In mathematics none could deny it. But, in life? In social existence? In ordering one's path and shaping one's course? In religion? In faith? How many are there bold enough to see and own that truth: "The whole is greater than its part"? All sober, truthful thinkers, all inspiring and inspired teachers, work on some such understanding. Take the very highest at once: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come He will guide you into all truth." So spoke the deepest of all Teachers, the Lord Jesus Himself; nay, He even added more certain words of large expectation: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on Me the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do." Now, my friends, if Jesus Himself so clearly protested that not even in His own words was the fullness of God's truth exhausted, surely we must prepare our minds for very large ideas indeed.

Even the Gospel truth of Christ Himself is not the final word of God to us.

And this is exactly what St. Paul believed. His words in my text may be, by more careful translation, made the exact counterpart of Euclid's axiom: "When the whole is come, then is the part cancelled"; or "the whole is greater than and supersedes its part."

Last Sunday we had before us a subject which is of the profoundest importance, but which in the limits of a sermon it is impossible to do more than barely touch upon. The patriarchs had certain distinct definite promises made them—or, at least, hopes were put before them which they so interpreted. Yet as a matter of fact none—mark, not some, but none—not a single one of any of these promises of earthly happiness ever was fulfilled. And as with them, so with each succeeding stage of the great story of the Redemption of Israel—kings, prophets, martyrs, heroes, all looked for a hope, which hope led them at last from the less perfect to the more perfect. Finally, the Apostles, taught by Christ Himself, they looked eagerly day after day for Him to establish His throne in righteous power. God showed them that holiness is better than correctness of life; faith is greater than sight, and love is nobler than power. Christ's kingdom never came to them in any other way than that in which it may come to one and all of us here.

But, friends, we cannot, we dare not, stop here. If that has been the way of spiritual development for man in the past, it is possible that the way is the same now. But is it the same? The bold in faith say joyfully: "Yes; it is." The timid and fearful say anxiously: "We hope and trust it is not."

We ask, then, Is there a parallel in modern life to this kind of experience?

Take by way of illustration that which St. Paul takes in the very next verse: "When I was a child I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man I put away childish things."

Now even the least wise of parents adopts some method of gradual development of knowledge in dealing with a child. You let your children think certain thoughts which are not absolutely correct, because without so thinking first, they could never grow to understand the fuller truth. But as the years go on the largeness of the truths partially realised dawns on the child's mind. The childish forms in which they were held are grown out of as simply and as naturally as the childish clothes are grown out of. For instance, contrast the child's idea of distance and size with the man's.

With these thoughts to guide us let us look now at this wondrous chapter, the ode of perfect life. See how St. Paul takes up virtue after virtue of the Christian life, and sees that each in itself is incomplete—it does not satisfy—it will not meet—the demands of the full nature of man. The beautiful tongue, speaking truth—the eye, which can pierce all mysteries and fathom all human knowledge—the faith, which, as he of all men knew, is the very door to heaven—the fervent charity, which gives all, even life itself, for the needy and the sad—these are all good, all grand, all noble; yet they are but "parts" of a still more perfect "whole." Even the best of the graces shall melt into the one great grace of the Love which cannot perish, "when that which is perfect has come."

But now mark the awful significance of all this. All good deeds, all good words, all deep thoughts, all sublime faith—faith which can move mountains—faith which can turn the world upside down—faith which makes a man see things divine—faith which leads the sinner to the blessed Saviour—faith which brings the prodigal back to God his Father—faith which turns the worldly-minded to seek life in the heavenly way—faith which endures to the end as seeing Him who is invisible: even faith is but a "part"—it is for a purpose beyond itself—it is but to lead you on; and then, "when that which is perfect is come," it is

done with: it was but a "part," and the part is lost, or, rather, passes into "the whole."

With this Sunday we close, as you are aware, the ecclesiastical year. Let it be our wisdom that we recognise that the law of our spiritual being is growth, and seek year by year to find more of the power of the Gospel of Christ translated in the form of our life.

But if we advance in grace it must be like every other advance—a leaving of the less perfect for the more perfect. There is a timidity so often in Christian souls which is fatal to vigorous growth. They are too well content. Of all things, what they least desire is, that *growing* in the knowledge and love of God which St. Paul besought for his friends. Of all prayers they are most reluctant to pray "Lord, *increase* our faith." Friends, let it not be so with us. Let there be more than the rudiments of the Gospel of Christ in us. Life is the outcome of life; let grace lead on to grace; be eager. Remember that what you have is but a part; its best service to you is that it should pass away in leading you on to a fuller form of truth.

Now, friends, what shall we say? Surely it is a noble thought here laid open to us. It may be expressed thus: Get all the Christ-like grace, all the highest virtue, all the deepest knowledge, all the "parts" of Christian life in its richness and variety; get as much and as many of these as possible; let them grow, mature, bear fruit to the fullest extent of their power; and yet withal add this further thought that, at the richest and fullest, they are but signs and symbols of what is yet to come. "We know in part, and we preach in part," says St. Paul; 'but when that which is perfect—the whole—is come, then that which is in part shall be done away."

Most of those who know this life we speak of at all, have known the same way of beginning it. The first great thought of Christ is that He will, of His infinite mercy, and gentleness, forgive men their sins. You have sins, you have guilt; you know the wages of sin to be death; death even now working in you, and you cry to the great Sin-bearer for help, "Save, Lord, we perish." You have just the same definiteness of hope, and the same absence of all further plan and purpose to follow, as the drowning sailor has, who strains every nerve to keep afloat till he is rescued. He wants—very definitely, very desperately, very clearly he wants—*to be taken off that sinking wreck.* The future, with its new demands and difficulties, he leaves alone. Life and safety *now* is what he seeks. And just as definitely, just as exclusively does the soul of a man cry out for life and safety now as he looks from the wreck of sin to the Saviour of sinners.

But is that all? Far from it. Just as the rescued sailor, brought safely to shore, *has to set about the business of life*, so the rescued soul of man, brought safely to Christ, *has to set about the great business of salvation.* Peace and safety were his cry. He gets these from the Peacemaker and the Saviour, Jesus. But is that all? No. He finds "peace" means peace with God that there may be war with sin. Is he disappointed? No. He sees that that is better, nobler than he had imagined. He is told the commands of his Lord. He obeys, or seeks to obey? Why? Because they are commands. Is he free then? No, not yet, not quite. But he obeys in faith. He trusts God, he believes that his Master knows best. And then, at last, faith gives way to love, to knowledge. He sees that godliness, Christ-likeness, and spiritual life are all good and beautiful for their own sake. They are the very best. He has grown, you see, from faith to love; from trust to knowledge. "That which is perfect being come, then that which was in part is done away." "Perfect love hath cast out fear."

But don't let us stop even there, friends. I venture to say that no single follower of Christ the Lord has found the Christian life as simple or as easy as he had hoped to find it. At first it was to be that he, like Abram, should go in and possess the land. But time shows that the land he first coveted will not satisfy. God shows you a more excellent hope beyond the one by which you were first led on to know the Lord your Saviour.

The young are rightly and properly led by hope of pleasure to attack the great task of life. That befits the child. Later, with those who do become men and women, and do not remain childish in full age, to love of pleasure succeeds the hope of happiness—a much more solid matter! And, in the search for happiness does many and many a one first learn to find their Saviour and their God. But to the wise, even that gives place to, even that is seen to be but a part of, a more perfect whole. From "happiness" they rise to seek "blessedness," with all the deep, sober well-springs of life contained in that word. Those who listen lovingly to their Lord and Master, soon learn from Him that that is the true prize, of which happiness is but a part; and very wisely do they conclude that "the whole is greater than its part."

Nay, and I dare not say that, even in this, there are not infinite stages of development; higher and higher forms of perfections.

There is just one further consideration which I should like to leave with you; it is a large one. St. Paul speaks elsewhere of the spirit of Christianity in us as being but the "earnest" or the pledge, or, so to speak, the "sample," of our full inheritance of spiritual powers. I can think of no grander expectation in which to live. Have you faith? Thank God for it; but thank Him the more because you believe it is but a foretaste—the sample, the earnest of the full faith yet to be yours. Have you knowledge—that great, beautiful,

ennobling knowledge of the being and ways of God, which makes "life eternal"? Thank God for it; but thank Him the more because it is but an earnest, "a part" of that "whole" which is yet to be yours. Have you charity—a love which gives you calm, peaceful communion and sympathy with all men? Have you a love which wells up from the depth of the human life in you to reach out to the utmost heights of your knowledge of God? Love to God and love to man? Thank God for it, brethren; but thank Him the more gratefully and fervently because you know that even that love is not yet perfect: it is a "part," not the whole.

And then be very bold, and say: "I will take all the graces and gifts of God which I can see; all the forms and ways of goodness here on earth; all the hopes by which the best and purest of Christ-like souls have been led upward and onward; and I will strive to realise fully that even these, at their best and highest, are still not the very God, not the very Christ. *He is more than all. These are but parts. I shall yet see Him who is the whole!*" And not see Him only, but be like Him. That this would be a wise and a safe conclusion, no one can doubt. As the blessing on Abraham far exceeded—because it was infinitely more spiritual than—the hope which first led Abraham on; so, we may boldly say, will the blessing on the Christian far exceed, in its pureness of spiritual richness, the hope which now, here, leads us to follow the Saviour Christ. "For now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face: now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known. When that which is perfect is come, then that which is *in part* shall be done away."

THE Patriarch of Jerusalem has sent a special letter of thanks to Dr. Liddon for the photograph forwarded to him of the new reredos and choir altar of St. Paul's Cathedral. Dr. Liddon was one of the first Anglican clergymen ever permitted to celebrate the Holy Communion in the well-known chapel of the Monastery of Abraham.

THE Rev. John Bridger, of St. Nicholas' Church, Liverpool, who sailed by the "Allan" steamer Sardinian, on the 11th April, in charge of a large party of emigrants under the auspices of the S. P. C. K. writes from Halifax, N.S., under date 20th April, as follows:—"We have reached Halifax to-day, Saturday, after a capital trip. The passengers are all in good health and spirits after such a good journey. I have to thank the 'Allan Company' very much indeed for their kindness and attention to my large party. The Chief Steward and his staff have as usual been most attentive to all our wants, and the accommodation for the people—both male and female—has been excellent. We were all Britishers on the vessel, the foreign passengers having been shipped all together in one of the other vessels of the line, leaving same day as we did. This is a fact not to be lost sight of by intending emigrants."

PAMPHLET and Advice FREE

Every man and woman in search of HEALTH should write without delay to Mr. C. B. HARNESS, *Consulting Medical Electrician* (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his *New Medical Work*, entitled "Harness' Guide to Health," which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of Harness' Electropathic Belt and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper.

MR. C. B. HARNESS also gives Advice Free of charge (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 18, 1889.

THE NEW CODE.—III.

SINCE we went to press last week there has been an important debate in the House of Lords. The general feeling appeared to be that, educationally speaking, the Code was a good one. Lord Cranbrook's speech was sensible and plausible in many respects; but he could not give a satisfactory solution of some questions, while he left others untouched. It must be borne in mind that as President he is not the Department, and in the words of Lord Harrowby, the assurances of any Minister are of no avail except during his own tenure of office. It would, indeed, be intolerable if existing schools were to come under the new Space regulation, especially where their accommodation had been originally restricted in order to obtain a grant for building purposes. Lord Herries very properly urged that the same cubic space ought not to be required in the country, where the air is pure, as in towns. We should be inclined to go a step further, and granting that this clause would hardly be operative in a single case, we would have it noticed that to make the proposed alteration would imply a negligence on the part of the Education Department hitherto, inasmuch as if 80 feet be insufficient in the future, it was equally so in the past, and therefore, if additional space be required, there ought to be a provision made for it, if only in atonement for the previous sanitary omission. Health requirements are not matters of opinion and convenience, but of absolute physical necessity. Then as to the Staff, there is no doubt that at present the Church Schools have an excess, taken *en masse*, of 45 per cent.; but the distribution is not equal. It will be the smaller schools which

suffer by this change. Most of these are carefully and well taught; but they would be swamped by having to provide additional teaching staff. This is where the shoe pinches. By all means let the stimulus of self-help be continued to the Voluntary System; but where it is unmistakably up to the mark through the "hard and fast line for securing efficiency" being enforced, why go beyond this? We cannot follow Lord Cranbrook's argument that the Voluntary Schools have become weaker in consequence of the 17s. 6d. grant. If some struggling schools are a hindrance to the progress of education by encouraging inferior teachers, the evil will not be remedied by crushing out other schools which are creditably worked. We have purposely avoided an analysis of the new payment system, as that has probably been more widely discussed than any other part of the present measure; but we are bound to say that instead of economy in expenditure, as recommended by the Royal Commission, the Code seems to make very free with both public and private money. As an instance, take the new publishing rule. On application to the Department we were informed that, though no decision had as yet been arrived at as to what this rule should involve—whether on the church door, in the newspaper, or elsewhere—it was quite certain no allowance would be made to pay for it, thus, of course, adding to the burdens of all but Board Schools. With regard to the question of a share in the rates, Lord Cranbrook's remark becomes clearer the more closely we examine its bearings. He says that since the majority of the Commission who were in favour of this concession have begun to get into conference with one another, they have abandoned it. One reason for this is the danger of giving any loophole to those who are agitating against the Voluntary System. Mr. Chamberlain talks of Free Education as close at hand, and a Bill is being prepared to compel the use of all schools in receipt of a grant for political meetings and kindred purposes. The State is thus to claim a lien upon the building, even though its grant does not serve to pay for keeping it in repair! There is no difference in principle between this proceeding and laying claim to use the houses of State-paid officials for public purposes, if those houses happen to go with the government post. The *Record* truly says, in an able article on the financial aspect of the Code, that in its present form it is a step in the direction of Socialism, and that we shall soon be called upon to clothe and feed the children of the working classes as well as educate them. We may add, indeed, that it and the Bills we have referred to are likely to bring discontent, communism, and wholesale plunder in their train if allowed to become law. Everyone must admit that Lord Cranbrook is desirous to give the Voluntary Schools fair play, and that he is really anxious to be just and fair to both sides. If we could get common justice, and be exempted from paying for Secular Schools when we support our own, we should be content. If Mr. Gladstone and his allies would carry out the principles he enunciated in 1873 we should have no fault to find. We will conclude with an extract from the ex-Premier's speech of August, 1873—"I believe that voluntary education is in itself the best. I am of opinion—I do not refer to education or anything else in particular — that whenever a thing can be done by voluntary means, other means should not be called in. As to the security of conscience provided by law, and as to the question of Board Schools and Voluntary Schools, I deprecate all depreciations and disparagements of either one or the other." Would that he thought so still. But the wind has changed many times since then.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

Fourth Sunday after Easter.

In all times of the world's history, no matter how peaceful, there have been those to whom law and order are obnoxious. We go back to the very beginning and we see Eve, the victim of uncontrolled curiosity; not willing to submit to the law which hid *one* thing from her, and so obtaining the knowledge of evil and bringing the first sin into the world. We see the same thing repeated in these days, when persons indulge a morbid curiosity and endeavour to pierce beyond the veil which hides the world of spirits from our view; persons who, scorning the marvellous revelations made to us on every hand, will have more —and obtaining it, suffer. These are days of progress; of free thought and action. Days when the great privileges of liberty are perforce taken advantage of by souls incapable of using them aright. And if these things are so in the world, they are equally true of affairs in the Church: they are absolutely true with regard to our own hearts. If we look around the Church at large, we see many instances of the "unruly wills and affections of sinful men" in the bickerings and quarrels which go so far to weaken the cause of truth and order in our land. Should we not do well to pray, in this connection, that we may love more fervently those things which God commands? If so, surely we should be anxious for the triumph of those things which make for peace and edification, rather than for the gratifying of our own particular whim. And is there not often an unworthy dissension in our own hearts? Have we enthroned the only true King and said, "as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord"? Alas! how often are we compelled to own that "other lords have had dominion over us"; that we have *not* ranged ourselves steadily on the side of right and law. We have been rebellious and disobedient. We then, at least, can pray all the prayer; and so doing, shall receive an abundant answer in this world, and a sure hope of reaching forward to the glorious inheritance spoken of in the Collect. Having determined, God helping us, that His Will shall be ours, His wishes our commands, then "amongst the sundry and manifold changes of the world, our hearts *shall* surely there be fixed where true joys are to be found." Our allegiance given to the King, His Peace shall descend upon us: our Master shall be honoured, and we shall find good for our souls.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE CAUSE OF ALL OUR DIVISIONS — THE CHURCH CATECHISM.—No. 2.

SIR,—Do I pretend to decide a question, which has divided the Church and puzzled the highest courts? Do I assume to give a meaning to a contested term? No, my aim is much humbler. I pretend only to answer a question, which every child in a class may put to me, "What is the meaning of the first answer on Sacraments in the Catechism?" Is it impossible to give him or her an answer? Cannot clergy explain what children have to understand? Monstrous thought! Let us then look at the answer. "A Sacrament is an outward and visible sign of an inward spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." Questions bristle at every word. "What is the grace given?" "Is that Sacrament a means of our receiving that grace?" "Is it a pledge that we do thereby receive it?" It would be monstrous to say that the grace is one that has been received already by the adult, or one that, by the infant, is only to be received gradually in after life. How could Baptism be the means of giving the adult what he has already? How could it be the means of giving the infant what he cannot have till after life? How could it be a pledge that he then receives what he cannot have till later? How a pledge that he then and there receives, what it is uncertain that he ever is to have at all? These are the questions which I am to answer, so that a child may understand me. What is to be thought of the Hampton Court Conference, if it drew up for children what no body of learned clergy can attempt to explain?

2. I am to confine myself to the first answer on the Sacraments. Who understands this? Who cares to understand, or pretend to hold, or teach, what it says? Let us look at its words. "A Sacrament," that is the form or matter of it, "is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us." Some relying on a comma say that what is given is only the outward and visible sign; others maintain that what is said to be given is the inward and spiritual grace. But the location of the comma is of no consequence, for what follows settles the question—"Given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means, whereby we receive the same," that is the grace, so the inward and spiritual grace is given unto us, for the outward part is ordained by Christ Himself as a means whereby we receive the inward, "and a pledge to assure us thereof," that is that we do receive it.

3. The outward part of Baptism is water with the appointed words and the application of the water. Here there is no question. The controversy arises as to the inward and spiritual grace, which the water is the means of conveyance. Some object to the water conveying anything. It is miraculous, it is said, as if that was a sufficient objection, when our whole religion is founded on miracles. But where is the miracle? "Arise," said Ananias to St. Paul, "and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Cannot God give pardon in the use of means appointed by Him? In the Divine mind we will grant that St. Paul was already pardoned. Yet a sealed sacramental pardon was handed to him in baptism. The Queen, by a stroke of a sword, gives knighthood. Cannot God do as much when we use the means ordained by Him?

4. The Prayer book calls this pardon and adoption Regeneration, meaning thereby only what infancy is capable of, and what St. Paul required. Some say that Regeneration means merely outward membership. If so, may not that be conveyed in baptism? Will that be denied as if it was miraculous? Why then should men object when we go farther and say that God really adopts the infant, and the sincere adult, "and that Christ embraces him into the arms of His mercy? Is this too miraculous to be believed? But the 27th article says that Baptism is more than a mark of difference between the christened and the unchristened. It is an instrument by which they that receive Baptism rightly, as all infants do, if any, are grafted with the Church, not outwardly only, but really the promises of forgiveness of sin and our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost are visible, signed and sealed." The 25th article says the same. "Sacraments be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be effectual signs of grace and God's goodwill towards us, by which He doth work invisibly in us, etc."—*signa per quo.*

5. It is quite evident that the Regeneration of an infant, which the clergyman asserts to God and man, as then having taken place, cannot be conversion, which is impossible to infants. It is equally evident that the Regeneration of a good man like St. Paul, which the clergyman declares to God and man, has then taken place, cannot be conversion either. It remains that all the Prayer-book means by the term is the sealed pardon and adoption of the infant or adult.

6. The first answer says that water baptism is the means of conveying this, and the pledge to assure us of the fact. But we must go on with the questions and answers.

Repentance and faith in the efficacy of the Sacrament are required in adults but not in infants, because they are incapable of them. The promises are made by others, to show that God's favour being continued to the baptized depends upon their conduct.

7. What is the inward and spiritual grace of baptism? Answer, a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness, *for* we are hereby made children of grace. Some say that the death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness mean conversion. But if so the *for* would be illogical, as being made children of grace does not contain in it conversion. The infant's death unto sin means only that he is partaker of Christ's death unto sin—sin had no more power to punish Him. The infant's new birth unto righteousness can only mean his being born into a state in which he will have all grace to lead a life of obedience to God. The death and new birth are signified by the plunging into the water and coming up again. It is an instantaneous act. "Hereby," it says, "it is done." Those who make out this to be conversion say that the work is gradual. So conversion is; but *this* is instantaneous. Some day this may take place in some cases, but not in all. But the water is not only a means in the case of some; it is a pledge that it is so in the case of all. If the Queen were to send money to a pensioner in a peculiar kind of envelope, the pensioner taking it in his hand would regard it not only

as a means whereby the means *might* come, but a pledge to assure him that the money is in it. We all know what means of conveyance are. Thus water and gas are conveyed to us by pipes. What would we think if the workmen on our tram lines were to cut and hack all our water and gas pipes, as if the water and gas could come to us without this intervention? Of course God can do without the water of baptism, as he did with the thief, and St. Paul until he was baptized. But he was the means as a conveyance to us of His assurance of pardon and adoption. We want without it that assurance, and disregarding it we disobey his command to use it.

8. There is an interpretation given which I will now state. The words are thus explained, "an outward sign which we receive the outward part." But, if the tautology be too absurd, let me explain it as others do. By the sacrament here defined is meant the whole service, and what we receive thereby is merely the elements. Now, let us look at this. By sacrament, in question and answer, is not merely the whole service, but expressly only the outward sign. And as to what is conveyed "a means whereby we receive the same," it is impossible that it can mean anything else but the inward and spiritual grace, that is if words can be pinned to any definite meaning. But suppose that we can understand it that the service is a means whereby we receive the elements, what do we make of the rest—"the sacrament is a pledge to assure us that we receive the elements?" Can absurdity go further than this?

In a future letter, if you will allow, I will treat of the questions and answers on the other Sacrament.

I now stop. If controversy follows, I shall be ready to defend all that I have said.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

THE monthly meeting of the Dublin Clerical Association, which was adjourned in consequence of the meeting of the General Synod from the 5th inst., was held recently at 37, Dawson Street, the Rev. Canon Bell, LL.D., in the chair. After the study of the Greek Testament and the transaction of the business of the Association, the Rev. M. C. Vincent, M.A., read a paper on "The Confessional in the Christian Church," which was afterwards discussed by the Revs. Canon Scott, Dr. Wright, R. Supple, Canon Carmichael, Ernest Fischer, W. Kittson, Phineas Hunt, Sterling Tomlinson, etc.—*Dublin Daily Express.*

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Ayles, Rev. H. H. B., B.A., Assistant Curate of St. Sepulchre's, Cambridge; Minister of Horningsea.
Bayly, Rev. Paget Lambart, M.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Ripon; Vicar of Arkendale, near Leeds.
Blyth, Rev. C. F., Rector of Wetheringsett; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Deanery of Hartismere.
Bourke, Rev. Cecil Frederick Joseph, M.A., Rector of St. Mary's, Truro, and Sub-Dean; Honorary Canon of St. Meriadoc in Truro Cathedral.
Colt, Rev. E. H. D., M.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Southampton; Rector of Monkokehampton, Devonshire.
Edghill, Rev. J. C., D.D., Q.H.C., Chaplain-General to the Forces; Honorary Chaplain to the Duke of Cambridge.
Emson, Rev. P. A. E., B.A., Curate of Market Drayton; Vicar of All Saints, Shrewsbury.
Flood, Rev. Samuel, M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Leicester; Rector of Ibstock, Leicestershire.
Fryer, Rev. W., Vicar of Dolphinholme, near Lancaster.
Holderness, Rev. Hedle J., B.A., Missions to Seamen Chaplain, Portland; Association Secretary at Manchester for the North Western Counties (except Diocese of Liverpool).
Hopwood, Rev. Harold Raleigh, M.A., Rector of St. James's, Manchester.
Hughes, Rev. Hugh Trevor, M.A., Vicar of Nerquis, Flintshire.
Jenkins, Rev. Thomas Jones, B.A., Curate of Mydrim, Carmarthenshire; Perpetual Curate of St. John's, Morriston, Glamorganshire.
Jones, Rev. John Morlais, Curate of Cwmamman, Carmarthenshire; to the District Chapelry of St. Catherine's, Brynamman.
Lascelles, Rev. Hon. J. W., M.A., Rector of Goldsboro'; Honorary Canon of Ripon Cathedral.
Lewis, Rev. John Morgan, Curate of Bettws; Vicar of Llanddeinio, Cardiganshire.
Lonsdale, Rev. J. H., Curate-in-Charge of Weare.
Meyrick, Rev. A. W., Senior Curate of Eccles; Sole Charge of Trinity Church, Dublin.
Morton, Rev. E. H., M.A., Vicar of Esholt-cum-Hawkesworth, Yorkshire.
Pelly, Rev. F. W., Organising Secretary of Society for the Propagation of the Gospel for the Dioceses of Hereford and Gloucester, and Bristol.
Percy, Rev. H. V. Heber, B.A., Rector of Moreton Say, Salop.
Roderick, Rev. Evan Morgan, Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of St. Asaph.
Salmon, Rev. W. Bryant, M.A., Association Secretary to the Missions to Seamen for the East Central Counties, Peterborough.
Savage, Rev. Francis Forbes, Vicar of Flushing, Falmouth.
Sharp, Rev. Arthur M., M.A., Chaplain in the Madras Presidency.
Sheppard, Rev. J. Edgar, M.A., Sub-Dean of Her Majesty's Chapels Royal and Honorary Chaplain to the Queen; Honorary Chaplain to the Duke of Cambridge.
Sinclair, Rev. William Macdonald, Vicar of St. Stephen's, Westminster; Archdeacon of London, and Canon of St. Paul's.
Stevens, Rev. Thomas, late Vicar of Saffron Walden; Vicar of St. John's, Stratford, E.
Streeten, Rev. Septimus, M.A., Chaplain to the Missions to Seamen, Great Yarmouth.
Sweetapple, Rev. Henry Darrell Endell, B.A., Vicar of St. James's, Gloucester.
Trefusis, Rev. Robert Edward, Vicar of Chittlehampton, and Prebendary; Canon of Exeter Cathedral.
Vyvyan, Rev. Charles Shimmin, Rector of Ruan Major, Cornwall.
Williams, Rev. Peter, Senior Curate of Neath; Rector of Llanengan, Carnarvonshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Blunt, Rev. James St. John, Master of St. Katharine's, Regent's Park, Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen, at the Hotel D'Albion, Costabelle, Hyeres, on the 13th inst.
Braithwaite, Rev. Francis Robert, M.A., formerly Archdeacon of St. Kitts, West Indies, at 56, Osnaburgh Street, Regent's Park, on the 10th inst., aged 79.
Burgess, Rev. Bryant, M.A., Rural Dean, for thirty-nine years Curate and Rector of Latimer-with-Flaunden, at Latimer Rectory, Chesham, suddenly, on the 11th inst., aged 69.
Hardy, Rev. Charles, M.A., late Rector of Hilborough, Norfolk, and J.P. for the County of Herts, at 3, Victoria Park, Dover, on the 5th inst.
Knight, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Pitt Portion, Tiverton, at Tiverton, on the 6th inst., aged 71.
Maitland, Rev. Thomas Archibald Fuller, Vicar of Bilton, at Bilton, Harrogate, on the 6th inst., aged 39.
Moore, Rev. Edward, M.A., Canon of Lincoln, and Vicar of Spalding, on the 13th inst, aged 78.
Singleton, Rev. Joseph, M.A., for fifty years Vicar of the parish, at Babraham Vicarage, Cambridge, on the 3rd inst., aged 86.
Vaughan, Rev. James, Prebendary of Chichester Cathedral, for forty-eight years Incumbent of Christ Church, Brighton, at Guildford, on the 7th inst., in his 84th year.
Williams, Rev. Charles William, D.D., Rector of Christ Church, Brondesbury, and late Principal of the North London Collegiate School, Camden Town, at Brighton, on the 12th inst.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

By the Rev. GEORGE SALMON, D.D., Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, and Regius Professor of Divinity.

Sermon Preached before the General Synod in S. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, on Monday, April 29th, 1889.

"Then Samuel took a stone, and set it between Mizpeh and Shen, and called the name of it Ebenezer, saying, 'Hitherto hath the Lord helped us.'"—1 Samuel, vii. 12.

IN the form in which the constitution of the Church of Ireland was first submitted to the General Convention it was provided that, while the Diocesan Synods were to meet every year, the General Synod was to meet only every third year. The idea was that while it might be expected that there would be routine business sufficient to give employment every year to the Synod of each diocese, it would be comparatively rarely that matter would present itself of sufficient importance to engage the attention of the entire Church. But it was soon discovered that, at least at the outset of our work, annual meetings were indispensable. It was no easy task to replace the organisation which the Act of the Legislature had shattered. It had to be provided how, in future, legislation for the Church was to take place, how discipline was to be maintained, how offences were to be tried, how patronage was to be exercised, how finances were to be raised and distributed. It was not wonderful if everything could not be at first foreseen, and if, after a year's trial of our schemes, points should suggest themselves in which amendments might be supposed desirable; and soon doctrinal controversies arose, the result of which was that our formularies were submitted to a thorough examination, and for several years together the members of the Synod came up in full numbers from all parts of the country to take part in work the importance of which none could help feeling. But things have now settled down into the state which was contemplated at the time that it was thought that triennial meetings of the General Synod might suffice. A settlement has been made of all important questions which there would be a great deal of reluctance to disturb; and in other respects the working of our system has got into a settled routine, calling little for special interference. Yet we are not likely to give up our annual gatherings. To say nothing of the advantage of having a permanent tribunal with authority speedily to decide on any disputed point or redress any abuse, I believe it to be of the greatest benefit that leading men from every part of our island should thus be periodically brought together, so that it should be practically brought home to us that we are all one community. We must never forget that Christ did not come into the world to teach a philosophy by which men individually might be made happy, but to found a kingdom upon earth—a great society, the members of which should give each other mutual aid, and through co-operation with one another each should derive the highest benefit to his own soul. We can all understand what a mistake was made by men who made it the one object of their thought how each should save his own soul, and who retired into deserts, forsaking human society, in order, as they believed, to fight the battle with evil at more advantage where beset with fewer temptations. They did not escape temptation, and in refusing the help they were bound to give others they lost the help that brethren in Christ could have given them. It is easy for us to detect the mistake in this instance, but the truth is that this is but an extreme case of tendencies to isolation to which we are all subject. Christ in His Church disciplines us against these tendencies by a process exactly similar to that by which in the ordinary training of mankind the self-regarding instincts are elevated into the social affections. Our first cravings are for the supply of our individual wants; but for this no man is sufficient for himself, and in any case at first in our helpless years we owe everything to the love and care of others. Thus we are trained up to family affection, as we have experience of a love which counts others dearer than one's self. But as the experience of savage life proves, a solitary family would be wretched if it stood alone. It would be the prey of robbers, and speedily be plundered, enslaved, and dispersed. From these evils we are preserved by alliance with others, and in gratitude for the benefits received we owe our duty to the State, which grants us that protection; and as our hearts have been raised from self to family, so again are they raised from family to country, and we can even feel that the lives of those whom we love have been nobly bestowed if they have died for the country's safety. But even patriotism may be but an enlarged selfishness. It is apt to take the unamiable form—Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy; to make no account of the rights of those who are outside. "My country," right or wrong, was the maxim of one patriot, which has been accepted as a noble utterance by many others. Our Lord came into a nation in which a flame of patriotism burned as brightly as in any country, but its rule was to love the Jew and have no dealings with the Samaritan; and you know how our Lord, by His teaching and His example, instructed His disciples to look on Jew and Samaritan as owing a debt of love to each

other. So we find in the Acts that a Samaritan city was one of the first outside Jerusalem to be visited by the apostles; and at length the principle was fully recognised that in Christ there was neither Jew nor Gentile, Greek nor barbarian, but all were one in Christ Jesus. Now, just as in the natural world the individual is brought from self-love to family love, from family love to patriotism, from patriotism to general philanthropy, a similar training in enlargement of sympathies goes on in the spiritual world. We awake to spiritual life when we first appreciate the importance of the question, "What must I do to be saved?" But a man must have learned Christ's religion very badly if he stops there. Why, in the natural world there is no more important trust committed to us than the care of our own bodies. We fail, not only in duty to ourselves, but in duty towards God, if we do not each strive to keep his body, not only in health, but with all its powers duly cultivated so as to be qualified for doing God service, so as to be a vessel unto honour, sanctified and meet for the Master's use, and prepared for every good work. Yet what should we think of a man who made it his one object in life to take care of his own body? Nay, in one illustrious example of a man who subordinated everything to the cultivation of his own intellectual and æsthetic faculties, the admiration we give his success is largely tinctured by disapprobation and dislike. And those who retired into deserts in order to consecrate their lives to the saving of their own souls were really guilty of selfishness of precisely the same kind which we only excuse because we can understand how the magnitude of the interests at stake overpowered the balance of their judgment. Happily it is impossible for us, who have not been taught from childhood to look on men as heroic characters, who really deserve pity and excuse rather than admiration, to think of our own salvation, without being at the same time solicitous for that of others. Who is there that has not some so dear to him that the thought of being eternally separated from them would be intolerable? Then, when we have experienced the benefits to our own souls derived through the ordinances of the Church, and the means of grace therein afforded through the faithful preaching of God's word and the private counsels of godly ministers, we naturally desire to secure the continuance of these advantages, and so it is not difficult to enlist men's interests, at least, in the support of the ministrations of the Church they habitually attend. There is, as you know, a sect whose principles would lead them to frame no higher ideal of the Church. Those who are called Congregationalists acknowledge that a Christian ought not to remain isolated from others, but that believers ought to join together for common worship, and for the advancement of the cause of the Gospel; but they hold that each single congregation having these objects in view is a Christian Church entitled to stand independent of and irresponsible to any earthly authority. In other words, an individual Christian is not justified in isolating himself from others, but if he joins with himself a certain number of others (what number will suffice is not stated, but apparently it need not be very large), he and they may then stand independent of and uncontrolled by any one else. And since a man must be perverse and eccentric, indeed, if he cannot get at least some persons to join him, this theory of independent congregations seems not very different from that which allows every individual to try by himself to make his solitary way to heaven. It seems to me that there are many in England at the present day who would think it a great affront to be called Congregationalists, but who have adopted their principles unconsciously. It seems to be thought the proper thing that each congregation should conduct its worship in whatever manner it pleases; or rather, that each clergyman should order the service as he pleases, allowing those in his congregation who do not like it to stay away; and it is accounted a monstrous thing to interfere with his liberty. I observe also that several who fear that the laws of the State may press on them inconveniently talk with a light heart of Disestablishment, seeing, no doubt, their way to maintain their own services on the voluntary system, and regardless of the injury which would be inflicted on thousands of poorer districts incapable of providing for their own spiritual wants. It was happy for us that the circumstances of our Disestablishment made it plain to us that, if our Church was to continue to exist in this country, it could only be as a united body. At that time the condition of the parishes was very unequal. Some were ministered to by young clergymen whose incomes were secured to them, and there by very moderate exertion permanent provision for the future could be made. In others the clergymen were old; some parishes were actually vacant; some had one or more wealthy and liberal members who were taking a lively interest in the endowment of the parish; in others the members of the congregation were almost all poor. If each parish had worked separately the needs of a few could have been adequately provided for, but in many more the Church organisation would have been dissolved. But, happily, it was resolved that we should not follow the selfish rule of each man seeking his own, but that the abundance of those more favourably circumstanced should be made to minister to the relief of the necessities of others. At first it was attempted to include every parish in Ireland in one financial organisation, and there would have been many advantages if the plan could have been carried out. But however desirable it is to enlarge the sphere of our sympathies they are apt as they widen to lose somewhat in intensity, and it was found that better results would be obtained if men had the

object for which they were working tolerably close at hand, so that they might have an opportunity to mark the progress and result of their exertions. Thus it has happened that for many purposes each diocese is a unit, and there are many advantages in concentrating the energies of our people on the work which they have close at hand. But it would be a like fault to narrow our sympathies to our own diocese as to our own parish. And, no doubt, the prosperity of our Church in a great measure depends on the hearty union of all its parts and their harmonious welding into one complete whole. I believe that, independently of the importance of any business transaction at our annual meetings, the greatest advantage is gained from the mere bringing together of the leading members of the Church in the different dioceses, so that they can personally know each other, and thus come into more hearty sympathy with each other, profiting each by the other's experience, and adopting modes of work which had been elsewhere found successful. And if the necessity of obedience to a central authority puts limitations on our individual liberty, obliging us to refrain from some things we might wish to do, or to tolerate things that we ourselves dislike, we yield this obedience not from a prudential calculation of the advantages of union, but as matter of loyal duty to what we recognise as the representative of Christ's Church in this country. I have said how in the process of Christian training our sympathies are enlarged from individual to family, from family to parish, from parish to diocese, from diocese to National Church ; but I need not say that that is not the end. When Paul told his Corinthian converts, "We are the Body of Christ, and severally members of it," he did not mean that the Church of Corinth was the body of Christ ; nay, in the address of his Epistle he joined with them "all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours." We have cause seriously to lay to heart how much our unhappy divisions have narrowed our sympathies and hindered the Church of Christ from that work in the world which it might have accomplished if its members had been all heartily united together. And we must certainly take care that our patriotism do not degenerate into insularity. No foreign prince or potentate has authority in this realm ; no external Church has power to command our obedience ; yet as a Christian duty, in the interests of godly union and concord, we are willing to put restrictions on our liberty, and to refrain from doing things we lawfully might do, if the course we might ourselves prefer would alienate from us sympathies we are anxious to retain. But one thing must be borne in mind. Though it is God's method of training to enlarge our sympathies, we are not following His method if we sacrifice the smaller object to the larger. If you hear of a man or a woman absorbed in exertions for philanthropic objects, but leaving their own family neglected and uncared for, you know that is not real philanthropy. If a man be busy in exertions for Church objects, but not concerned about the state of his own soul, not himself living as becomes the Gospel of Christ, you know that what prompts his public work may be party zeal—it is not religion. It is when men faithfully fulfill the duties that lie near at hand that God rewards them by opening their eyes to see greater work that they may do for Him. And though it was necessary, by way of warning, to speak of the danger of forgetting that the Church of God is not limited to our own island, we may be sure that it is by cultivating love and faithfully fulfilling duties to brethren at home that we educate ourselves to take real interest in Christ's work abroad. It is very fitting that our great annual gathering for providing for the maintenance and improvement of our home work should commence in this cathedral, which occupies the unique position of being the cathedral, not of one diocese, but of the whole of Ireland. In undertaking for the first time to preach before the members of the Synod on the occasion of their annual meeting, I could not help going back in my thoughts to that Easter season, twenty years ago, when new cares, new responsibilities, new duties, were thrown upon us. It seems to me but a short time to look back on, and it requires an effort to realise that since our Church was disestablished there has been time for a new generation to spring up ; but one is made to feel the lapse of time by observing how many of those through whose exertions our Church was reconstituted are now no longer with us. Of the bishops of 1869 twice as many have died as now survive. There are many others whose wise counsels and generous exertions I remember with gratitude, who have now entered into their rest. Those who are too young to have known any of our anxieties of the year 1869 can at least understand how gloomy the prospect of affairs appeared to us when it was announced that the whole framework of our Church's organisation was to be dissolved, and all provision for its maintenance taken away. We were to enter on quite untried paths. It had been over 150 years since there had been any meeting of Church Synods. Our people had not been trained like the members of voluntary sects to contribute for the maintenance of a Christian ministry. There were many of us who thought—and, for my own part, I am not prepared to say, we thought wrongly—that the contemplated changes would be even more injurious to the State than to the Church. We augured nothing but ill from the diversion to secular uses of funds which our ancestors had dedicated to the service of God; and we believed that one inevitable result would be a great shake to the whole institution of property, and a general sense of instability, when a whole party was seen ready at the bidding of a political leader to reverse all its previous convictions. However that might be, there was enough to justify those who were dis-

posed to prophesy evil about the future of our own Church, when it was called to mind in how many places the members of our Church were but a little handful, a few sheep in the wilderness. It was feared that they would be scattered and lost when all provision for pastors was withdrawn; it was feared that the attractions of other more lucrative professions would draw away all men of ability and education; it was feared that when we had complete liberty to legislate for ourselves our Church would forsake its old lines and fundamentally alter its doctrine and discipline; and it was feared that in the attempts to make the least change dissension would be so hot that we should burst asunder and split into two or more separate communions. These fears have not been realised. As regards our financial position, indeed, we cannot speak too triumphantly. We must own that in many of the poorer districts miserably inadequate provision has been made; that in no place are incomes provided for our ministers comparable with those received by men of equal ability in other professions; but we can, at least, boast that we have not let go our hold of any part of the country; and we can thankfully say that each year young men present themselves as candidates for ordination not inferior to those who came forward at any previous time. Those who doubted our attachment to the episcopal form of government may be reassured by learning that in every diocese we have permanently endowed the sees, and have, even since Disestablishment, added one to the number of our bishops. I need not speak to the members of the Synod of what has been done in the way of building and restoring of churches. The members either here or in the Synod Hall have only to look around them. It is more important to note, with gratitude to God, how we have safely passed through those perils which threatened the disruption of our Church, how zeal for doctrinal truth was guarded by respect for the conscientious convictions of others with whom we knew that we agreed on points far more important than those on which we differed, and how controversies as hot and eager as ever had raged terminated with mutual respect and good will. It is nothing to boast of that our Church survived its separation from the State without serious injury. Nay, rather, if it had not been so, our enemies would have cause to say that our Church was a mere creation of Parliament, and not a divinely instituted society. But we may thank the good hand of our God upon us, which has safely brought us thus far. We do not pretend to be in the position of mariners who, having reached land, can offer thanksgivings for deliverance from dangers now no more to be encountered. There is still much in our future to cause anxiety. Our country is passing through nothing less than a revolution—a revolution which, I am persuaded, the future historian will date as commencing in the year 1869. A revolution is not less a revolution whether the descending waters dash themselves down in one wild leap, or pour along in boiling rapids. Whether any great catastrophe, such as some apprehend, be before us or not, we cannot tell. But we have already seen the fortunes ingulphed of many whose possessions and prosperity had seemed most assured. That there is cause for anxiety we cannot deny. But when Samuel raised his stone of Ebenezer it was not that all danger from the Philistines had passed. The Israelites had still to pass through times of heavy trouble, reaching a climax in the battle of Mount Gilboa, where their king and his son were slain, and the terror was so great that the Israelites forsook their cities, and the Philistines dwelt in them. Yet the stone of help might give them comfort in their trials, as reminding them of worse trials gloriously surmounted. There had been a time when even the Ark of God was a captive with the Philistines, and yet God had raised up a deliverer for them, and the power of their enemies for the time had been broken. When we are told of Paul that he thanked God and took courage, it was not that he had reached a position of safety; he was still a prisoner, on his way to appear before a cruel tyrant. And we, too, may thankfully acknowledge the good guidance of our God, who has safely led us thus far, not in the way of boasting or of triumph, but as giving us a reason to thank God, and take courage, and trust Him for the future.

"REST."

(*In Memoriam.*)

By the Rev. EDWARD A. W. SEYMOUR, M.A., Curate of Tamworth.

Sermon Preached at Holme Pierrepont, Nottingham, Sunday Morning, May 12th, 1889 (Third after Easter).

"And the same day, when the even was come, He saith unto them, Let us pass over unto the other side."—Mark iv. 35.

IT was after a day of exhausting toil that Christ proposed to His disciples that they should cross the Sea of Galilee, and seek a little rest in the retired country of the Gadarenes. The only chance of gaining a breathing-space was to resolutely tear Himself away from the thronging multitudes who were hanging upon His words, without so much as waiting to take a meal. "They took Him even as He was in the ship." They had not sailed very far, when a sudden squall of wind descended from the hills and seized hold of the fishing-smack. It could hardly live in such a sea. The waves kept mounting higher and higher and sweeping the deck; so great was their danger that the disciples, practised seamen though they were, gave up all for lost, and came to Christ, who was sleeping peacefully in the hinder part of the ship,

His head resting on the boat-cushion, and said unto Him, "Master, carest thou not that we perish?"

A few moments later the wind sank as suddenly as it had arisen; the waves hushed, and "there was a great calm." "And He said unto them, Why are ye so fearful? Where is your faith?"

This passage is full of meaning. Let us try to draw out one or two of the thoughts which seem to suggest themselves. In the first place, it is not wrong for those who are hard worked to seek now and then for rest and refreshment. The teacher especially cannot be always giving out without first taking in. It is not necessarily selfish to spend time over reading noble books, to look at beautiful pictures, and to drink in the lovely things in nature; for over and above the pleasure we derive ourselves we shall be able to impart our riches to others, especially to those who are unable to tear themselves away from the grinding pressure of incessant toil, even for a single day. Let us, as we are able and duty permits, "pass over"—away from our care and toil "to where beyond these voices there is peace." For a description of a storm at sea we almost instinctively turn to Psalm cvii., where the Psalmist dwells upon the exceptional opportunities that sailors enjoy for studying the ways of God. "They that go down to the sea in ships, that do business in great waters, these see the works of the Lord and His wonders in the deep. For He commandeth and raiseth the stormy wind, which lifteth up the waves thereof. They mount up to the heaven, they go down again to the depths; their soul is melted because of trouble. They reel to and fro and stagger like a drunken man, and are at their wits' end. Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble, and He bringeth them out of their distresses. He maketh the storm a calm, so that the waves thereof are still. Then are they glad because they be quiet; so He bringeth them unto their desired haven." Nor can we forget that marvellously parallel scene in Jonah, chap. i., which describes the prophet as fleeing from his duty in a ship of Tarshish. The sudden gathering of the storm, the fear of the mariners and the centreing of their hopes on Jonah, who lay fast asleep in the sides of the ship, all have their counterpart in the Gospel story. "So the ship-master came to him and said, What meanest thou, O sleeper? Arise, call upon thy God, if so be that God will think of us, that we perish not."

To be peacefully sleeping in the midst of a raging storm—what a beautiful image of a soul at peace with God, with nature, and with man! Sleep visits those who are free from care and anxiety. "Wilt thou," says King Henry IV., addressing sleep, "upon the high and giddy mast Seal up the ship-boy's eyes and rock his brains In cradle of the rude, imperious surge, And in the visitation of the winds? . . . Can'st thou, O partial sleep, give thy repose To the wet sea-boy in an hour so rude, And in the calmest and most stillest night, With all appliances and means to boot, Deny it to a King? . . . Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown!"

In the hurrying of the disciples to Jesus we see the triumph of goodness. When all goes well the good and the upright may be neglected and despised; but it is to them we instinctively turn in moments of danger or trouble. Let them keep a good heart, for at such times they are certain of their reward. If some sudden calamity were to overtake us, say an earthquake, a railway accident, or a fire, how should we behave? Should we be calm and confident, assured that at bottom all is well? Or, perhaps in coward fashion, like the disciples of old, give up all for lost, and need the administering to us of that gentle rebuke, "Where is your faith"? We shall find no firm standing-ground so long as our hopes are centred upon our chances of escape from accident, disease, or death. Why should we expect to be treated as favourites of heaven, and to be exempted from the ills which lay others low? No, our only guarantee of settled peace is to be prepared for good or ill, to trust in the general ruling of Providence, to be determined to see the hand of fatherly love even in the worst that could befall us. "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him." Then the storm of the soul abates, and there is a great calm.

In the words of rebuke addressed to the sea, "Peace, be still," we seem to have a foreshadowing of man's triumph over nature, for man was created to have dominion. "So God created man in His own image; and God blessed them and said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." This becomes truer and truer every day; the storm at sea has almost lost its terrors for the steamship which ploughs its way steadily on, regardless of wind and wave. We have stolen its secret from the lightning flash, and made it carry our messages to and from the ends of the earth. But man's triumph over nature is tempered by the sad reflection—Has he gained a surer dominion over himself? Does not the storm of his unregulated desires often rage as fiercely as ever? "Greater is he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city."

Taken in its wider sense, life is like a restless sea. It has, it is true, its blessed moments of calm and sunshine, but we must not be surprised if we meet with a few storms on our passage—some sudden squalls of bereavement, difficulty, agony, or distress. Because Christ is sleeping, we may be tempted to fancy that in this our hour of need we are forsaken and forgotten. We direct a hasty prayer to heaven, but no answer comes. The impenetrable silence of nature seems to mock us. "All things continue as they were from the be-

ginning of the creation," heedless of our suffering. The Universe is a chill, dark void, from which the warm light of God's countenance has been withdrawn. O! there is only one way in which to meet our suffering—in faith, with a tenacious confidence that the Judge of all the earth cannot but do right; that though He seems to have forsaken us, yet really He that keepeth His people shall neither slumber nor sleep.

Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take;
The clouds ye so much dread
Are big with mercy, and shall break
In blessings on your head.

Above all, let us not give way to despair. The difficulties which attack us from without ought only to draw out a corresponding energy from within. The weight of the atmosphere which rests upon our heads is so great that it would crush us to powder were it not that our bodies are inflated by it, and offer a like resistance from within. The pressure on the outside is neutralised and the balance restored by a like pressure on the inside. But if the storm be so difficult to weather, even when God is on our side, in what jeopardy—in what danger of shipwreck must they be in, who are without pilot and rudder, the plaything of wind and wave, without aim and object, knowing not whence they came, and with little idea of the direction in which they are going, who live merely for self and for the gratification of the moment! Inaction is death. For the boat which is making no way to be caught in a sudden storm means imminent peril of shipwreck. Let us take God into our hearts as compass, pilot, and rudder; let us open our natures to His love, and listen to the "still small voice" which speaks within. And let us not hesitate to embark upon the sea of duty, but rather launch forth upon the waters which, sooner or later, all must cross, and "make for the other side." Let us "put off the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts . . . and put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."

So shall we gain the "desired haven."

Sleepe after toyle, port after stormie seas,
Ease after warre, death after life, does greatly please.

HEREDITY.

By the Rev. GEORGE BLADON, B.A., Vicar of S. Luke's, Chadderton, Oldham.

Sermon Preached at St. Mary's, Oldham, on Sunday, May 5th, 1889.

"A man shall be known in his children."—Ecclesiasticus xi. 28.

SO says the author, whoever he may have been, of the Book called Ecclesiasticus—a Book which forms part of the Apocrypha, or marginal border of the Old Testament, as the Judicious Hooker, the greatest of our Elizabethan divines, has well called it.

And when our author so says he is laying down a general rule—generally speaking, not always—shall a man be known in his children. There are exceptions, of course. Thus we may say that Elkanah and Hannah were known in Samuel their child, for in the sight of all men they were approved as God-fearing parents, when Samuel, whom they had dedicated to the Lord, became a prophet of the Lord. But, on the other hand, although Eli was himself a God-fearing man and an upright judge, yet he was not so approved, for his sons neither feared God nor regarded man. Their wickedness, we read, "was very great before the Lord," and it caused men to abhor the offering of the Lord. And we still see the same kind of exception to the rule that a man shall be known in his children by simply looking around us. We sometimes see the drunkard's child the soberest, steadiest man in the whole parish. And we see, also, far, far too often, those who have been brought up by godly parents in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, who have been blessed with parents well aware of and obedient to that commandment in the Book of Deuteronomy—"These words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up; and thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes," but who yet have turned aside and gone away, like the prodigal son in the parable, wasting their substance in riotous living.

Yet for all that, generally speaking, the rule laid down by the author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus is right, "A man is known in his children." He is known in many ways. For instance, he is known very much by the way in which he regards them. Speaking generally, there are two ways in which a man may regard his children. He may think that although they give a brightness and cheerfulness to his home, yet they are at present more or less a trouble and an expense; they have to be fed and clothed and educated; they bring in no return as yet; but they will do; their wages will be useful when their school time is done; or they will be able to help in the shop or the office, and carry on the business or profession; or, again, they will inherit the family name and rank, and keep together, it is hoped, the family property.

Now, such a merely worldly view as this is quite bad enough, far too bad for any one ever to admit that he holds. Yet, as a matter of fact, many do hold it; you know that they do by the little slips they make in their talk. It is simply the property view, the worldly view, and of course no man ever admits that he holds such a view, any more than he ever admits that he *is* worldly.

But, on the other hand, a man may regard his children in this way. Children, he may see, are a trust, a responsibility—and a very serious responsibility, too. The child is to a very great extent what the parent makes it. It has, indeed, inherited a certain character and certain tendencies, but nevertheless that character and those tendencies can be very much moulded and shaped and altered. Its future, both in this world and in the world to come, depends very much on how the parent does its duty towards it. And when a parent has got that far in his thinking, he may be inclined to adapt the Apostles' words, and say, "Seeing then that these things are so, what manner of man ought I to be?" That is the religious view, the view taught in the Bible; namely, that your child is a trust given you by Almighty God, a trust for which you will be held responsible. You will have to answer to God how you have discharged that trust—a view which if you do adopt you will be known in your children by their at least moving what the ways of the Lord are.

And so we pass on to another way in which a man shall be known in his children; the ends and aims and desires of his own life shall be known by the kind of training and education which he gives them. A man may train and educate his children one way by setting before them some such view of life as this: You have got to make your way in the world; you must try and get rich if you can, and in every way you can; you must push yourself forward; you must get on; you must rise in the world. That is one kind of training and education, and I freely admit that if taught with insistence and persistence, and if, above all, you are that kind of man yourself, so that you can teach it by example as well as by precept, it will probably prove more or less successful. Your child will get on in the world, and will become just such a man as our Saviour has described in one of His parables, the kind of man who says in his heart—yes, and sometimes says it publicly, too—"I will pull down my barns and build greater, and there will I bestow all my goods; and I will say to my soul, Soul, take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. Or, in other words, you will be known in your children what sort of man you are yourself, that your aims and desires are for the world and for the things of the world, that you mind earthly things; and you will train up your children to become hard and selfish and worldly. In your old age, when it is too late, you may find that the ingratitude of a thankless child bites sharper than a serpent's tooth.

But, on the other hand, you may set before your child some such view of life as that which St. Paul set before the Philippians: "Finally, my brethren, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsover things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, think on these things." You may train your child to believe that a good character is man's best possession—better far than learning, ten thousand times better than popularity, incalculably better than wealth. You may teach your child that if he does no deed he need be ashamed of, then he may look any man fearlessly in the face. Teach your child that, then you will at least be known in your children that you have set your own affections on things above, not on things of the earth.

I think a man is very much known in his children by the way in which, when they are growing up, they spend their Sunday. I do not mean while they are still quite young—young enough to obey, or at any rate not to dare to disobey openly their parents' orders, not old enough yet to dare to follow their own inclinations and desires. But I mean that a man is known in his children by their way of spending their Sundays during that period when they are getting old enough to decline, if they choose, to submit any longer to be in leading strings—when they are old enough to choose *wrong* for themselves if they will. That is a very critical age; it is just the age when many cease altogether to attend Sunday-school, and become only occasional worshippers in Church. Probably no questions are more frequently debated in clergy conferences than these;—How shall we retain our elder scholars at the Sunday-school? How shall we keep our young men within the Church's ranks? I venture to think there is one and but one answer to both these questions. Retain them by the example of their parents. Children are quick-sighted and quick-eared;—"Little pitchers," says the proverb, "have large ears." If your children see you indifferent to the ordinances of God's house; if they see you irreverent, careless, and prayerless during the service; heedless and inattentive to sermons; if they know that though your newspaper is read daily, your Bible is read never; if you follow always the throng who refuse the invitation to that Sacrament when the spiritual food of the Body and Blood of Christ is verily and indeed taken by the faithful—then, though they may be scholars and church-goers during childhood's days while they must, they will not continue to be so in the license of youth and manhood. They, too, will neglect church worship; they, too, will slight rites and ordinances and ceremonies; they, also, will make answer to the invitation to the Lord's Supper, "I pray thee have me excused!" their Bibles, like yours, will be on the shelf, but not in the hand; and thus the unreality of your religion, the emptiness of your profession, will be known in your children. But in homes where Sunday is a day, not of Pharisaic sanctimoniousness and gloomy self-righteousness, but of wise and loving light and leading towards the sound and wholesome doctrines of the Gospel of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, there we may well believe that the Psalmist's promise shall be fulfilled, "Blessed is every one that feareth the Lord that walketh in His ways. For thou shalt

eat the labour of thy hands; happy shalt thou be, and it shall be well with thee; thy wife shall be as the fruitful vine upon the sides of thine house, thy children like olive branches round about thy table. Behold, thus shall the man be blessed that feareth the Lord."

And if a man shall be known in his children, then the churchmanship of a man, whether it be real or whether it be only feigned, shall be known by his attitude towards, and by what help he gives to, the children—the little ones—the uncared for little ones—the stray lambs of Christ's flock. Do you, any of you, ever go amongst—do you not see our ever-swelling infant population? And what do you think their future will be? The fate of thousands upon thousands of the children of the city depends upon this one thing, that they should be brought under some permanent—not some merely transitory—but some permanent religious influence. Under certain intellectual influences they are indeed brought; after so much the State does indeed see; but our unhappy differences in this falsely so-called Christian country have forced on the State the bad compromise of no religious teaching worthy of the name in Board Schools, which do indeed sharpen the children's wits, but sharpening wits is one thing, and education—the education that forms character—is quite another.

And I ask, Does this state of things satisfy you? Are you content with this practical atheism, this infidelity which does not in any real sense of the word provide for its own? Just as a man shall be known in his children, so shall his churchmanship be known in the children of the Church, cared for or neglected. History will pass its verdict on this generation as on every generation, according to its care for, or its carelessness about, the welfare of the generations which shall follow them. You may increase your fleets and armies, you may extend your empire and your commerce—it mattereth nothing while you are rearing in your midst a godless and therefore a dangerous class, by whose worldly lives the nation can never be exalted. For righteousness exalteth a nation, and if you unrighteously neglect the welfare of their souls, be assured that in the end they shall rise up in judgment against you, and shall condemn you.

Yes, the wise, and ofttimes witty, and always interesting author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus was right, a man shall be known in his children. The man that feareth the Lord, God sets a mark on that man; He sets the seal of His approval on him by blessing his children also. "I have been young," says the Psalmist, and now am old, but yet never saw I the righteous forsaken nor his seed begging their bread." And again our author says, "Ye that fear the Lord hope for good and everlasting joy and mercy. Look at the generations of old and see; did ever any trust in the Lord and was confounded? or did any abide in His fear and was forsaken, or whom did He ever despise that called upon Him? For the Lord is full of compassion and mercy, long suffering and very pitiful, and forgiveth sins and saveth in times of affliction."

And, last of all and best of all, a man shall be known in his children, because they shall carry on his work. The next generation shows, in every case, the work of this generation, whether it be good or whether it be evil. If you be idle, selfish, heartless, worldly, you shall be known in the idleness, selfishness, worldliness, of your children when they grow up and fill your vacant place. But if you are working for Christ and the kingdom of Christ, no matter how humbly,—then thank God that your children will carry on that work, and carry it on better. If you lay a foundation, they shall build thereon; if you labour, they shall enter into the fruit of your labours. And is not that sufficient? What matter although you yourself be forgotten; a man shall be known in his children, and the work you have done shall be seen in the works which they continue to do. Doubtless you yourself *will* be of the countless multitudes that have no memorial. "Some there be," says our author—say rather, almost all—"which have no memorial"; but then "these were merciful men whose righteousness hath not been forgotten, with their seed shall continually remain a good inheritance, and their children are within the covenant."

THE Church of England Temperance Society has received £100 from an anonymous donor to provide a missionary for Clerkenwell Police-court. A similar sum has also been promised by the Rev. Dr. Oliver, vicar of St. Mary's, Ealing, for a missionary for Thames Police-court.

THE *Daily Telegraph* says:—"Country clergy who come to town for the May meetings—a much smaller number, by the way, than in former years—have been requisitioning the services of the Church House in a manner which promises well for the future usefulness of that much-satirised institution. As yet not many rooms are available, and only £60,000 of the necessary quarter of a million have been raised, but the library, the commitee rooms, the inquiry department, and the accommodation for Bishops during the sittings of Convocation are felt to be of great utility."

THE following protected parties under care of chaplains, and, in the case of single girls, of matrons, have been despatched by the Church Emigration Society this year:—April 4, by the *Sarnia*, from Liverpool, principally families and single men to Nova Scotia, by special arrangements with the Bishop; April 18, by the *Oregon*, from Liverpool, families and single girls, mainly for Manitoba and the North-Western Territories; April 18, May 2, and May 17, by the *Nestorian*, *Assyrian*, and *Canadian*, from London, for all the Canadian provinces. For Australia, on May 10, a protected party of single girls, in charge of the Society's matron, Miss Ashby, sailed by the *Austral*, berthed in the deck-house, separated from the other third-class, and provided with special comforts; chaplain, the Rev. J. M. Vaughan.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE,** or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW,** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary, **OBESITY IS CURED,** and will be sent, **gratis and post free,** on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.

(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 25, 1889.

THE LITERATURE OF THE DAY.

WE are very glad to see that the Committee of the Cardiff Church Congress have decided to discuss the subject of the Literature of the day, and its attitude towards Christianity in connection with modern philosophic thought with reference to the alleged scepticism among the working classes, and in the treatment of religious questions by means of the novel. Anything more important we can hardly imagine, and we trust that those to whom the subject is committed will deal with it in a practical manner.

With regard to modern philosophic doubt, we believe that there is a growing tendency towards what is known as Agnosticism. We frequently hear of those who deny the efficacy of prayer as a means of bringing down a blessing; and if we may credit all that Mr. Spurgeon has told us in his "Down Grade" pamphlet it is not only men of the world who have begun to discard time-honoured doctrines, but even men who profess Christianity, and who are set up as teachers of it, seem to set little store on the distinctive doctrines of the old faith, wherein our fathers lived and died. And not only is it with these, but with the young men who, to use the words of the Bishop of Peterborough, begin "to air their *free thought* before they have learned to *think*." The current literature of the day, especially in a certain class of magazine, seems to cast religion on one side, either as obsolete or not requiring the thought and attention of men, for this reason it is most incumbent that clear statements of doctrine should be put forth in as trenchant a manner as possible; if there are doubts, let them be boldly met. With regard to the alleged scepticism among the working classes, it is true that there is a great deal of this in certain parts of the country; but the greatest evil lies in the fact that there is abroad a spirit of complete indifference among by far the larger mass of working men at the present day. It was said some time ago with respect to South London, that Christianity was not in possession, and what was stated of a portion of the metropolis is undoubtedly true of other places. And what is the cause? We firmly believe that the example set by many of the so-called upper ten thousand has a very great deal to do with it. When the working man, be he a collier or iron-worker, knows that his employer is scarcely ever seen in Church, and hears that he spends his Sundays in a certain way, is it very much a surprise to find that he follows the example thus set, and in his way cares little for religion? for such the truest literature is surely a better example. With regard to real scepticism, we believe that what is wanted is plain statements of doctrines, the very dogmas of Christianity to be plainly stated in pamphlet and tract, so that they can be clearly understood; and, therefore, those who undertake to write these should be persons who have some practical knowledge of the men for whom they write. It is all very well for authors to fix up dummies and then to employ all their skill to knock them down, but this is not sufficient for the present day, and such a matter as scepticism is too solemn to be handled in this way. We should never expect much in the way of results to be arrived at from a man who entered into a debate with an infidel, but who was defective in his armoury, and had not his brief well prepared. So, too, the same remark applies to literature. No defective armoury is required, but clear statements of dogmatic truths and doubts to be fairly and honestly met. We are afraid that in many cases the literature which has been published has not been sufficiently convincing, and we imagine that there is no work which the Christian Evidence Society could undertake with better results than this.

The treatment of religious questions by means of the novel is a very difficult one. Many writers of fiction seem to have felt that their works were to an extent incomplete, if religion were left out entirely; and so it very often happens that some unfortunate cleric, generally a curate, has been made a prominent figure. We object to such fiction, inasmuch as we fail to see what good it can produce. On the other hand, we have read Edna Lyall's interesting works "Donovan" and "We Two," and feel that they are instructive in many ways, and we do not forget that Donovan was led to disbelieve in the power of Christianity through the evil example that was set him—thus proving what we have stated before, that indifference and scepticism is often fostered by the bad example of those who ought to know better. The latest phase of religious fiction is "Robert Elsmere," a strangely

fascinating book. Yet while it shows how a man may lose grasp of faith, and has the boldness of his convictions, and so give up his position in the Church, at the same time we question whether it can be of any real service except to show how a man by historical research may ultimately lose grasp of the faith. Some have thought that its tendency is dangerous; it may be to those who have no clear foundation and whose faith is wavering, but it will not however shake the faith of those who have their feet firmly planted on the Rock, it will rather enable them to hold the truth with a stronger grasp.

We shall await with interest the results of the debate, and trust that some lasting fruits may be the outcome.

Reviews and Notices.

"The Sermon Bible," Vol. III. Psalm lxxvii. to Songs of Solomon. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

We have received the third volume of this most useful publication, the only so-called preacher's help we can honestly recommend, because it does not save, but excites thought. It is not, however, a book that a reviewer can say much about—he can recommend it, and we do recommend it, but extracts are useless. Nor can we recommend every preacher to play the game of "follow my leader" indiscriminately. Hugh Macmillan may preach from "Comfort me with apples;" J. Vaughan, from "I am black, but comely;" Mr. Steel, from "A living dog is better than a dead lion"—why was not A. K. H. B.'s sermon from the same text referred to?—Keble, from "Be not righteous overmuch;" but lesser lights may not do well to follow their example. The Germans have a proverb, "Every monk cannot stand in Martin Luther's shoes;" it is of universal application. And we wish the publishers would have added a few blank sheets at the end, as they did to the first volume; perhaps they will to the next, which we shall be glad to receive as soon as possible.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY.

Sir,—Mr. Walker writes:—

"As a rule I avoid theological discussions; they are rarely satisfactory."

I should think this a very likely result, if these discussions are conducted by Mr. Walker on the same lines as the present. Instead of attempting to disprove my argument, he entirely evades the point, and contents himself with a lengthy reiteration of his former letter. I raised a clear issue, and challenged Mr. Walker to disprove the conclusion arrived at. I repeat that challenge. Surely "I disregard the quotations" is no disproof, but looks uncommonly like the last refuge of a defeated disputant.

"In every case man may carry out his own will against the express will, command, or purpose of God."

Was there ever a more reckless statement than this made? Are men's powers of carrying their wicked wills into effect altogether *unlimited?* Is there no necessity whatever for men to say, "If the Lord will." Is there, then, no overruling Providence? Is Psalm xxxiii. 10 only an empty boast: "The Lord bringeth the counsel of the heathen to nought; He maketh the devices of the people of none effect"? Was Pharaoh successful in his will or purpose to bring the Israelites back?

Another absurdity:—

"I acknowledge His Sovereignty, and within certain limits I say it reverently, His Omnipotence." "I confess I cannot reconcile my idea of God," etc., "except upon the principle that evil is also omnipotent." "I fear this clashing will continue until that happy consummation arrives, when 'the kingdoms of this world,'" etc.

Will Mr. Walker explain how such a consummation is possible or conceivable, with an *omnipotent power for evil* opposed to a power for good only omnipotent within certain limits?

"God gives a law, 'Thou shalt not steal.' But men do steal. Therefore there is a clashing between the Divine and human purposes."

This, I think, is a fair statement of Mr. Walker's contention. Let us examine it. Now I am prepared to admit there is on the surface an apparent plausibility in this deduction. But it results, as I think I can show, entirely from confused ideas and a confused vocabulary.

A man in the face of God's law makes up his mind to steal. Now what is the Divine attitude, the Divine mind, or (if I may be allowed the expression) the Divine feeling in relation to the man's decision? Most clearly opposed to it. This Divine *attitude* Mr. Walker persists, in his loose vocabulary, in calling the Divine *purpose*. And this is where he falls into error. But we must not stop here, for we are considering an evil purpose carried into effect. The man perpetrates the theft. What was God's purpose in relation to its execution? Clearly to permit it to take place. For if God had purposed, willed, or determined to prevent its execution, the robbery would not have taken place. Hence there was no counter purpose in God's mind with which the man's purpose clashed.

This argument seems to me clear and logical. If it is not, will Mr. Walker expose its fallacy?

My critic seems very fertile of illustration; but I need hardly point out to him that if this argument be true of one wicked purpose carried into effect, it will equally apply to the sins of *the fall*, *the deluge*—all and every sin past and present.

RICHARD DIXON.

London.

Sir,—The existence of evil is a problem which no man will ever be able to solve. Many have attempted it; all have failed. There is too much mystery in it. We must let it alone.

We own God's Sovereignty. We proclaim His Omnipotence. We turn aside. We are confronted with the existence of evil. We are confounded. We try to explain it all, but we do not succeed.

Mr. Dixon thinks he sees two omnipotent powers—the one omnipotent for good, the other for the evil.

This because the One Omnipotent hath said, "Thou shalt not do evil"; and the other omnipotent (?) hath said, "I will do evil." He forgets that the Only Omnipotent hath said, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Now it is quite clear if the evil one were omnipotent he would answer, "But I will not die." It follows, then, that he is not omnipotent.

But why, then, is he not at once suppressed? Have we any right to ask this question? God permits the evil. This ought to be sufficient for us. The fact of His Sovereignty warrants this.

There is a peculiar expression in Num. xiv. 9, "They shall be bread for us," which we should do well, as I think, to meditate upon. This is said of the enemies of Israel. God's ancient people are a type of His redeemed ones. Bread is food. Enemies were Israel's food. Evil is our food. Contending with it we become valiant for God. There are profitable thoughts here. Let us work them out.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, May 19th, 1889.

GRATUITOUS SCEPTICISM.

SIR,—"A Good Friday Meditation" in the PULPIT of the 27th April ends with these words:—

"Our senses are made powerless, so that neither the Apostles nor we are left with any certain proof that the same body died that lived and taught and suffered before the Apostles' eyes."

I ask in much perplexity, what is this intended to mean? It seems to me a foolish and dangerous juggling with principles of evidence — a believer playing into the hands of unbelievers in order to show that he can afford to do so. Surely it is as certain as any fact can be, that the Christ who died on the Cross was the same who taught by the Lake of Gennesareth, and agonised in Gethsemane. But, as Bishop Butler remarks, we are not to expect demonstration, though we may have certainty, in matters of fact.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 4th May, 1889.

THE MINISTRY OF EVIL.

SIR,—I must ask permission to offer some comments on Mr. Sandlands' letter in this day's PULPIT.

I am obliged to renew the protest I made when I had some discussions with him a long time ago. He does not quote the words of an opponent fairly, and sometimes attaches a meaning which the words used do not convey. I assert, without fear of contradiction, that a Christian man is imperatively bound to observe the rules of truth and equity.

My words were: "Thirty years ago, the conviction flashed upon me, after reading the Bible through several times, that it is the firm purpose of God to deliver all the intelligent creation from evil, through the superior energy of moral good." He represents me as saying, "All intelligent creation will become good," and thinks himself entitled to use a few notes of exclamation. He also represents me as saying, "A conviction flashed across my mind," and that the said conviction was momentary.

The fact was, and I think my words intimated as much, that the conviction flashed upon me with the vividness of lightning, accompanied by a luminous chain of texts, and that this conviction has never been impaired or weakened since then. I leave it to the judgment of intelligent persons whether numerous instances are not recorded of sudden convictions presenting themselves to human minds on points of high importance.

I do not pretend to judge the mental processes of this gentleman. I referred to his language given forth publicly. I quoted his own words, without addition or *alteration*, and expressed my inability to see much difference between such declarations and those of infidels. Yet I am prepared to believe that he would shrink with horror from any conscious insinuation against the wisdom and benevolence of God. So, likewise, I accept the mysterious fact that multitudes of those who calmly, serenely, and even almost joyfully anticipate endless sin and misery in the universe, profess a fervent belief in the sovereignty of God, and the heart-stirring proclamation, God is Love.

I do not understand the two positions which Mr. Sandlands seems to attribute to me at the close of his letter, and kindly refrains from calling absurdities.

J. B.

Canonbury, 11th May, 1889.

ACTS XXIV. 20, 21.

SIR,—In a recent leading article (page 598), the *Spectator* makes the following somewhat surprising statement:—"Even St. Paul *reproached himself* with having raised a somewhat false issue when he set the Pharisees and Sadducees by the ears, by suggesting that he, a Pharisee, was called in question for his belief in the resurrection of the dead," and refers to "the scruples which St. Paul *avowed that he felt* when he had succeeded in embroiling the Pharisees with the Sadducees concerning him." (The italics are not in the original.) Surely this is nothing less than a blunder, and a somewhat careless blunder, which might have been avoided by a little study of the passage. St. Paul, so far from "reproaching himself," and "avowing the scruples that he felt," was really replying to the charges made against him by a *reductio ad absurdum*. The matter is clearly put in the well-known commentary of the S. P. C. K. by Canon Benham (Acts xxiv. 18-21): "St. Paul gives the finishing blow to their charge in this sentence, 'In these deeds of charity and obedience to the law the Jews found me, whilst I was undergoing ceremonial purification in the Temple, without noise or excitement of any kind. And this, forsooth, they call sacrilege! It is these men who say that they found me, and not Ananias and Tertullus, who ought to be here to accuse me. But I propose an alternative. If it is too late to bring forward these Jews from Asia who profess to have seen my crimes committed, let us hear from the lips of those elders who *are* here whether they heard me say any wrong before the Council, unless, indeed, it is an offence in their eyes to express a hope in the Resurrection'—this hope and belief in the Resurrection being a vital part of the creed of the Pharisees (Acts xxiii. 8), who (as, for instance, Gamaliel) were 'had in reputation among all the people' (Acts v. 34; Josephus)."

H. HEBER EVANS.

May 17th, 1889.

ARCHDEACON SHERINGHAM commenced his Visitation at Gloucester Cathedral on the 29th ult. In the course of his Charge he said that the Reformation was a broad line of cleavage as regarded the social *status* of the clergy in the body politic. The religious houses were centres of holiness and light; but the light was under a bushel and not on a candlestick. Then came the great spoliation; and the tyrant, too faithfully copied by his successors, in a very few years scattered the accumulated devotions of centuries. After referring to the clergy of the Restoration, the Archdeacon said he was driven to conclude that the full influence of the Church upon our social life was never much felt till her clergy learnt to be diligent in pastoral visitation. It was necessary, he thought, that the clergy should be in the best sense, men of the world. "There are many things which do undoubtedly constitute a large portion of our social life, and it is no excuse for me to say that I am reading divinity or attending to my parish, if I refuse to recognise them as being beneath my notice and mere carnal matters. Say what we will, people will have their dinner parties, lawn parties, and other amusements. Query, are the clergy compromised by sharing in them? As a matter of fact, the Church has not a little influenced society in these everyday things. Seventy years ago not a few of the guests would rise from the dinner table flushed with wine—some carried away in helpless intoxication; they were certainly not scenes for a clergyman who respected, to say the least, himself. Go now to an ordinary dinner party, and the chances are you will find three or four clergymen present, rational and intellectual conversation, and some of the guests total abstainers; if a man became intoxicated I don't think he would be found there a second time." Referring to the question of the pulpit and the evils of society, he said he did not want to see their pulpits turned into chairs of moral philosophy, but he did know that they would not falsify the model of their Divine Master if they stepped down now and then from divine to human things. "And," he continued "this leads me to speak about a tendency in modern clerical thought which I strongly deprecate—a *sacerdotal caste*, which practically means a celibate clergy, living a life of partial seclusion from the world. Now, I by no means say that clergy colleges may not do an immense amount of good, missionary or parochial, in overgrown or waste and desolate places. But I wish them to be exceptional, not normal, having a special end and not a systematic purpose. I myself infinitely prefer to see the clergy moving freely in social life and leavening it. As things are now, the bridge which spans the social chasm is the Church. Her sweet charities bring together rich and poor; they kneel together in her temples; the sympathies of innocent childhood are fostered in her schools; in her burial grounds they sleep together. Almost every week we read of some Church function in our country districts, in which clerics and laymen come together from miles around. The alienation of classes would soon stop all that—you hardly read of such things abroad—and it would be well if mutual animosities did not succeed to alienation and rend society in twain. In the middle ages the noble and his well-armed retainer had no fear of an unarmed working class. Things are very different now; the balance of power is seriously shifted; a Jacquerie in the England of huge towns and swarming industries would indeed be a dreadful thing."

A NEW organisation somewhat on the lines of the Salvation Army is about to be started. It is to be called, says the *Rock*, the Saviour's Missionary Army, and one of the essentials is that all its officials shall be members of the Church of England, although the organisation will carry on its work entirely independent of Episcopal control.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bedford, Rev. William, Rector of St. Peter's, Mosley-street, Manchester.
Bell, Rev. Thomas, Rector of Vale, Guernsey; Honorary Canon of Winchester Cathedral.
Bromley, Rev. N., Warden of King's College Hospital.
Buttanshaw, Rev. John, M.A., Prebendary of Easton-in-Gordano in Wells Cathedral.
Byng, Rev. Hon. Francis, M.A., Chaplain to the Speaker of the House of Commons; Grand Chaplain of England in Freemasonry.
Cochrane, Rev. David Crawford, M.A., Vicar of Etwall, Derbyshire.
Crosse, Rev. Arthur Adam Taylor, M.A., Vicar of Hickling, Norfolk.
Ditchett, Rev. H. A., Vicar of South Scarle-with-Besthorpe and Girton, Notts.
Dobie, Rev. A. C., Vicar of Harmston; Vicar of Bramshaw, Wilts.
Dundas, Rev. R. J., Rector of Albury, Surrey; Honorary Canon of Winchester Cathedral.
Dyce, Rev. A. F., M.A., Permanent Winter Chaplain at St. Raphaël, Dept. Var, France; Summer Chaplain at Wildbad, Black Forest.
Evans, Rev. Daniel, M.A., Vicar of Bangor; Canon of Bangor Cathedral.
Flynn, Rev. J. S., Missions to Seamen Chaplain at Falmouth; Rector of St. Mewan, St. Austell.
Gace, Rev. F. A. J., Chaplain to the *Asia*.
Hodge, Rev. W. H., Vicar of Manaccan, Cornwall; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Cornwall.
Lucas, Rev. W. H., Rural Dean of West Fordingbridge, and Proctor in Convocation; Honorary Canon of Winchester Cathedral.
Muir, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Wallington, Surrey; Secretary to the Church Parochial Mission Society.
Overton Rev. Frederick Arnold, B.A., Curate of Headington, Oxon; Organising Secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society for the Diocese of Oxford.
Pitman, Rev. J. H., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Ganges*.
Powell, Rev. Isaac Ormsby, M.A., Rector of Horne, Surrey.
Powell-Williams, Rev. M., L.Th., Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Brecknockshire.
Ramsden, Rev. Henry Plumptre, B.A., Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Diocese of Chester; Rector of Cottingham, Yorkshire.
Robertson, Rev. Norman Conolly, Rector of Sutton-cum-Duckmanton, Derbyshire.
Rountree, Rev. H. J. H., formerly Church Missionary Society, Punjab, and at present in temporary charge of the parish of Rushden, Northants; Junior Chaplain on the Bombay Establishment.
Sharp, Rev. Arthur Ainsworth, M.A., Curate of Southwell Minster; Chaplain in the Madras Presidency.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Armstrong, Rev. Charles Edward, Rector of Stonton Wyville, at Bournemouth, on the 15th inst., aged 49.
Breffit, Rev. George, M.A., at Onega, Weetby-road, Boscombe, on the 15th inst., aged 29.
Cottam, Rev. Henry, M.A., Rector of St. Mary's, Crumpsall, Manchester, at the Rectory, on the 19th inst., aged 52
Evans, Thomas Saunders, Canon of Durham, and Professor of Greek in the University of Durham, on the 15th inst., at Weston-super-Mare, aged 73.
Herring, Rev. Nathaniel Rogers, at 2, Westbourne-park-crescent, on the 20th inst., aged 80.
Pettigrew, Samuel Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Hatfield, Herefordshire, t Leominster, on the 19th inst., aged 64.

The Church of England Pulpit.

BALAAM AND HIS MOTIVES.

By the Hon. and Rev. EDWARD LYTTELTON, M.A., Assistant Master at Eton College.

A Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday, May 12th, 1889.

"For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"—Matt. xvi. 26.

THE prophet Balaam, of whom we read in the lessons for the day, is mentioned more than once in the New Testament as a warning. Among the many points of interest suggested by his story I will select these. Is it possible for us to discern the chief motive which induced him to act as he did? Next, to what did this motive lead him? Lastly, is it a motive which is found operating among men now? We will only consider those parts of the narrative which are necessary to the answering of these questions.

We first hear of Balaam as living far away at Pethor, on the river Euphrates, probably as head of a college of prophets.

We gather from the story that he was a man of splendid endowments and renowned for his wisdom and prophetical gift. Suddenly in the middle of his ordinary life a crisis comes, and on his behaviour in that crisis the whole of the rest of his life, the whole of his reputation among posterity was to depend. You know what happened. The king of Moab sent him an enticing offer. Honour and wealth were put within his reach if he would go and curse the invading army of the Israelites. But God forbade him, so he refused; again the offer was made, more temptingly than before. Again Balaam told the ambassadors to tarry, and we read that God came to Balaam at night and said, If the men are come to call thee rise up and go with them; and in the morning he rose up and went with them.

Now, so far as this, the story shows us one thing very plainly. Balaam was anxious to go. Something in the offer tempted him.

We can hardly be wrong in saying it was the prospect of one of two things, either the increased wealth or increased honour. In short, whatever it was, it allured him with the chance of something more dazzling than his present way of living. In one of these respects Balaam must have thought that his life at Pethor was limited; and he was possessed with a strong desire to sweep the limitations away. Very likely this was a perfectly innocent desire in itself, but it could only be gratified at the cost of disobedience to God. But Balaam was not satisfied with one indication of what his real duty was. He practically made up his mind to obey his inclination before he waited for God to tell him a second time. Now God does not coerce man's free will, so the prophet was permitted to go. By this time his spiritual eyesight was confused. He consoled himself with thinking that he would resist all temptation to utter anything except what God ordered. He was not afraid to go full into the danger. His desire for Balak's gift was too strong to be altogether resisted. He must at any rate go to the scene of action. But he meant to speak so as to lose the reward after all, and yet for the sake of that reward he was tampering with his duty, and playing with a deadly temptation. That seems to have been the disordered state of his mind as he started on his journey, which was pronounced by the angel to be a foolhardy journey. We must now rapidly recall the sequel. How did this rash venture of his end?

The incident of the angel appearing to the prophet as he was on his way is familiar to us all. But it is not commonly recognised that for a time it made him a different man. It woke up the hero within him; and we next find the prophet showing himself to fullest advantage, surrounded by all the pomp of the Moabite court, urged, entreated, and threatened by the bewildered king, but standing firm against it all; using his magnificent gifts of mind in the service of his God, and able to scorn for a time the enticements of sin and the praise of men. How unlike the vacillating Balaam at the beginning of the story, cheating his conscience and beating his faithful beast in his remorseful hostility to God! But, alas! for the human heart, this was not the end. This man could be a hero on occassions, but what was he when the reaction came? Now he had done his duty splendidly. Was there no way in which he could still secure the coveted reward? He had told Balak that the Israelites were not to be conquered by force of arms, and so he cast about for some way of circumventing God, of evading the very prophecy which he had just uttered.

Unfortunately there was a way open to him. We read that the fair Midianitish women came into the camp of the Israelites and tempted them only too successfully to join in the foul idolatrous rites of the heathen. It was a horrible and crafty device, and the whole guilt of it is fastened upon Balaam. He had suggested this to Balak. Look at the strength of the Israelites: you will never overcome them by force of arms; try and undermine them by lust. This monstrously wicked advice was acted on with fatal effect. The Israelite warriors plunged into the impure excesses of the heathen worship, and from the plague that followed, 240,000 of their men perished. The nation never was the same

again. Far away down the lapse of time prophet and Psalmist lamened the guilt of Baal-Peor. How pathetic are the words of Hosea alluding to the innocence of Israel in the wilderness: "I found Israel like grapes in the wilderness; I saw your fathers as the firstripe in the fig-tree at her first time, but they went to Baal-Peor and separated themselves unto that shame."

But though fatally injured they were not undone. War ensued, and we find the prophet actually fighting in the ranks of the enemy of Israel, where he was miserably slain.

There is something most striking about the completeness of this tragedy. We have before us, recorded in a narrative of wonderful simplicity, a stupendous collapse of a character. It reminds us of some of Shakespeare's great dramatic portraits, of men who, starting from some ordinary moral perverseness, end in terrible ruin. But nowhere is the contrast so violent as that between the prophet Balaam with his noble endowments, his large insight into God's ways, his lofty heroism, and Balaam stooping to a wickedness peculiarly diabolical in its low cunning, but at the same time full of a strange infatuation, and foredoomed to failure. What we have now to ask ourselves is this, What was the power of the motive in this man's heart which could work such ruin? What was it that first led him to tamper with his conscience?

We go back then to the beginning of the story and recall the fact that the desire which wrought such havoc with Balaam was merely a desire for a more distinguished life.

The lesson becomes clearer if we look at his conduct in the most favourable light. Perhaps it was not merely honour or wealth which he wanted, but simply that he was anxious to gain a position where he could do more in the world, do more for God. Was there not a fine opportunity here? He saw a chance of teaching these ignorant heathen the knowledge of the true God. His life, perhaps, had become stale to him; it was too small, and a man with his gifts wanted a wider sphere in which to fulfil his true vocation. How reasonable, how attractive, would the idea look to him. Very likely every argument was in his favour. If he asked counsel of his friends, would not they all advise him to go. It was manifestly to his advantage. Why should he refuse? Here is a chance, they would say, which a man only gets once in a lifetime; the moment has at last come for you to show what you are made of. But all the time deep down in the recesses of his heart, making itself heard in the silence of the wakeful night, was the still small voice which told him that in spite of all appearances, that life at Pethor, dull and incomplete as it seemed, was the life for him. His real duty lay there, and at the bottom of his heart he knew it.

It is easy for us to see this, looking back as we do on a finished tragedy, now that the story is closed, and the unhappy man gone to his last account. Let us consider some modern parallels. Are any of us tempted with exactly the same temptation, as Balaam, in England to-day? Suppose a young man has to choose a profession. In many cases the choice is a very small one, but what are the reasons which influence him? We cannot judge anyone. God only knows the secrets of the heart, but the evidence given by what people openly say is not very reassuring. Is it not the case that to judge by ordinary conversation, by books, by newspapers, by letters, the real questions which are asked are not where will he do most good, where does the country most require him, but rather where will he enjoy himself most, or where will he make most money, or most reputation? Again, suppose a clergyman has a small poor country living, he is spending a narrow limited life, and on a sudden there comes an offer of a larger sphere of work, a more conspicuous position, a larger income. To judge by what people say, is it not considered very strange if he refuses for the simple reason that he thinks he is doing God's will where he is? Or, again, to take another class of society, do not men and women in domestic service speak of the chance of bettering themselves? Do they always consider that perhaps they would better themselves in the only true way by staying where they are, simply because God means that to be the scene of their life's work? It may of course be their duty to go, but surely the meaning commonly given to the word is to go to a new place where they will receive higher wages, and when they do this without consulting God or against the dictates of simple duty, they are falling into the sin of Balaam. But our thoughts are carried more particularly to that large class of men and women who find their lives somehow cramped, or narrow or dull, and cannot reconcile it with their ideas of what they are fit for. Perhaps it is want of money, or of sympathising friends, or of opportunities of usefulness, or of talents, that leads them into fretfulnesss and discontent. They feel certain that some other line of life would bring them out. Their efforts are not appreciated; their relations don't appear to need them. I am thinking especially of some who are bound down to small earnings and long monotonous hours of labour and routine; or of women brought up in refinement, led to expect lives full of enjoyment, usefulness, admiration, and who find themselves past the prime of their youth living lonely, small unrecognised lives, where nobody seems really to need them, and such gifts as they have got are turned to no account. How hard it is for them not to let hopefulness gradually give way to impatience, and impatience to despair.

It is indeed hard. It is so natural to chafe at the limitations of life. But if our work for God lies among limitations—and whose work does not?—whenever we fret in our longing for a wider scope and more generous opportunities, we are yielding

in our hearts to the same sin which brought Balaam, the son of Beor, to ruin.

But we have not yet answered the question wherein lay the power of this motive, this wish to escape from the limitations of life, that it was able to do so much harm. The answer is that this desire, dissociated from God's will, is totally un-Christlike. Our Lord's life on earth was not the escaping from limitations, but the welcoming of them in fullest conformity to God's will. Never were such transcendent gifts so wonderfully controlled, so subordinated, so repressed. The life might have been glorious beyond words in man's eyes. As it was, it was without honour, without lustre; it was monotonous, toilsome, painful, but in complete harmony with God's will. Balaam knew nothing of this, but we do. We have been shown how these very hindrances to our development, these wearisome small curtailments of our best powers, are not to be fretted at nor fled from, but welcomed with a deep voice of thanksgiving. We may judge the prophet if we will, as one who had the splendid chance given to him of being a forerunner of the Son of God in renunciation; the chance of taking up his cross, of living unknown indeed to history, but still as one in whom God would have been well pleased; and as an alternative, the chance of gaining glory among men, at the cost of nothing but a little tampering with conscience. He chose the latter, and instead of gaining glory, is held up as a warning to all ages. We may judge him I say if we please, but let it be with fear and trembling. We are they to whom much has been given, and of us shall much be required. We are allowed not only to hear the warning voice of the Old Testament, but the gracious promise of the New Covenant. No sooner are we terrified by the sad story of the wilful prophet than we are cheered by the assurance from lips that cannot lie of the power which is ours to lift our voices to God in time of need, of the Holy Spirit given that we may know what God would have us do. How can our lives then be too narrow, too dull, too obscure? God is the Lord who hath showed us light; and now we can see that the heavy shadows of our earthly life are penetrated with a radiance that cometh from our Father's throne.

THE Bishop of Lichfield has gone abroad for three or four weeks in the hope of getting rid of a long-continued attack of rheumatism.—*Church Times.*

THE Bishop of Ripon, who spent a considerable time in Cornwall last year, has again taken Greatwood, near Penryn, for two months, and has taken up his residence there.—*British Weekly.*

THE *Church Times* says that the Bishop of St. Asaph will take up his residence at Llanymynech (a parish partly in Shropshire and partly in Montgomeryshire) rectory during the present month, and will take duty there in the absence of the rector, who has been in ill health.

THE HUMILIATION OF CHRIST.

BY THE REV. J. W. KAYE, M.A., RECTOR OF DERRYBRUSK, ENNISKILLEN.

SERMON PREACHED IN DERRYBRUSK PARISH CHURCH, ON THE SIXTH SUNDAY IN LENT, APRIL 14TH, 1889.

"Jesus Christ, who being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient (even) unto death, yea, the death of the Cross."—PHIL. ii. 5-8 (R.V.)

WHATEVER people may say or think about Christianity, they cannot deny its existence. Christianity is an historical fact. It has its own doctrines, institutions, ceremonies and Scriptures. Its form of worship is continually observed, and its adherents are found in every part of the habitable globe.

History and human experience bear witness to the fact of Christianity. But as systems, institutions, religions and philosophies do not create themselves, so Christianity was not founded or created without a Christ. If Christianity is an historical fact, so also is Christ an historical fact.

No man of education, now, denies that Jesus Christ lived. The ancient writers and historians tells us He lived, and was crucified under the Roman Emperor Tiberius. The terrible persecutions against those "called Christians," and the fearful sufferings they endured rather than deny Christ, are again and again recorded. The Catacombs or burial places at Rome are yet to be seen, bearing historic testimony in their numerous inscriptions to the great facts and doctrines of Christianity. Jesus Christ, the founder of Christianity, has a personality, a character, and a history absolutely unique. He is peculiar to Himself. He was a man above all the rest of men; His life was perfect, His knowledge divine, His actions sinless, His teachings and example were in purest harmony. He could wield omnipotent power, but He taught that humility, patience, and self-sacrifice were among the highest virtues; and that it is nobler to suffer than take revenge. He taught the world the great need and value of truth and purity and love. He taught the world to seek for righteousness, peace, reconciliation. and eternal life. He taught that He Himself, is "the way, the truth, and the Life;" and that "no man cometh unto the Father but by Him." His injunction to all men is to take up the cross and follow Him.

If you would follow Him more fully, let us learn the lessons of our text, and behold Him sacrificing His glory and enduring the depth of humiliation for the redemption of the sinful sons of Adam. We learn that

I. HE LEFT HIS HEAVENLY GLORY.—"Who

being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself." These words imply first of all, a state of pre-existence—Christ being or subsisting in the form of God. This does not mean simply that the Divine nature was in Christ. It means He pre-existed as a "form" or manifestation, arrayed with glory, beaming forth from the essential majesty of the invisible Deity.

Christ "being in the form of God," is Christ possessing the sovereign majesty, the almighty power, and the infinite glory of the eternal God. His is the throne, the sceptre, the diadem, and the innumerable company of angels. He is the eternal Word and Wisdom of God, subsisting in ineffable glory in the bosom of the eternal Father, and with God in the councils of everlasting ages. He is the image of the invisible Father, the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person. The words of Christ Himself are, "I came from the Father and am come into the world." "Before Abraham was I am." And when the redemption of man was concerned, He did not count this glory and equality with God a prize—a thing to be grasped and held fast; but He willingly gave up His glory, "He emptied Himself," "He made Himself of no reputation." Here is Christ's humiliation. He who was before the world was; He who is from all eternity; He before whom cherubim, seraphim, angels and archangels, thrones and dominions, did bow themselves in prostrate adoration; He grasped not to hold this unspeakable majesty, but for man's sake, for man's redemption, "He emptied Himself."

For man's redemption! O what a heart has our Emmanuel! O bosom of infinite love! For us, "a crown of righteousness." For us, a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory! Hear His gracious words, "What more could I do for My vineyard that I have not done!" The redemption of man is not an after-thought with God, for Jesus Christ is "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Go back to the beginning of Time, before the sun, moon, and stars were called, into being, and there was "the Lamb of God." Go back and gaze upon eternity; peer into the mystery of the everlasting ages, and there is the Son of God, in "the bosom the Father," enshrouded in that mysterious "glory which He had with the Father before the world was." Yet, this is He who is emptying Himself, putting aside His glory to "obtain eternal redemption for us." "The high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity," descends from His throne; to be born of our flesh, to die on the Cross, a sacrifice for sinners. Does not such love unspeakable win your souls to adoration? Our text leads us to the next step in our Lord's humiliation.

II. He became Man.—"Taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men." St. John says—"The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." The Eternal Word took on Him, man's nature; the Divine nature took the human nature: but in so doing He did not cease to be Divine. As the clouds veil the brightness of the sun, so the human nature of Christ veiled the brightness of His Godhead. In taking upon Him the form of a servant, He came to fulfil the law which man had broken, and to bear the punishment which was our due. He clothed himself with our feeble mortal flesh, and became subject to grief and sorrow, and all the insults and indignities which men and devils could heap upon Him. Yet He was both God and man. The Jews kept the two ideas of God and man absolutely distinct. When Jesus sought to teach them that He was one with the Father, and in Him the human and the Divine met together, they stoned him for blasphemy—"Because that Thou being a man makest thyself God." Men did not even conceive the idea of a God-man before Christ came; then they dared to think and believed it possible. It was the fact from God that produced the thought. God and man became one. Hence Jesus said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," "I and my Father are one." A king does not always wear his royal robes; sometimes he goes about in the apparel of his subjects. So Christ took off his royal robes, put aside the glory of His Godhead, and in His incarnation He put on the apparel of His subjects. He passed by the nature of angels and took on Him the seed of Abraham. From the highest glory He descended to the low estate of sinful man. Sin like a pestilence had filled the earth, and between man and God there was a great gulf which all the sacrifices of the Mosaic law had been unable to overcome. But Christ came and took our nature and became the God-man, and thus bridged over the stupendous chasm. He came and tabernacled in our mortal flesh; and, by the communication of the Divine nature, He wrought a moral and spiritual renewal of man. The chain of human progress which had been broken by the power of sin he reconstructed, reinvigorated, and endued man with the power of an endless life. Hence the Apostle St. Paul says, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you, both to will and to work for His good pleasure."

The Incarnation of God the Son opens up a highway between earth and heaven. Man is brought nigh to God and God draws nigh to man. It was necessary that God should become man, if man was to be brought to God. Man was helpless, a rebel, condemned without hope, but Christ has become for us "The Way, the Truth and the Life," and we behold "the light of the Knowledge of the Glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ." His humiliation has displayed a glory incorruptible, a condescension unparalleled, and a love omnipotent. Finite wisdom will never be able to fathom the infinite depths of the mystery of godliness,

'God manifest in the flesh." "Truly this is the Lord's doing: it is marvellous in our eyes."

Yet further our text tells us that,

III.—He suffered Death on the Cross.—"And being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross." Sometimes there are great difficulties in the way of obedience. And sometimes it requires a great sacrifice to become obedient. In the way of Christ's obedience stood death itself, "Yea, the death of the cross." And do we not value that obedience the highest which is the most difficult to yield or perform? How great and estimable then was the obedience which our Lord yielded to His Father. How fearful was that hour of woe in dark Gethsemane, burdened with a sense of the world's sin. "Father, if it be possible (if Thou be willing) let this cup pass from me, nevertheless, not My will, but Thine, be done." O what self-sacrificing obedience! O what adorable humility! obedient unto death, yea, the death of the shameful, accursed and ignominious cross! In that midnight hour they seized Him and led Him away from His prayers to a mock trial; those rude Roman soldiers and armed attendants. And the vile betrayer, Judas, came, saying, "Hail, Master," and kissed Him. What a look of pity Jesus cast upon him as he perpetrated that act of loathsome perfidy. And at that false trial, yea, while His enemies mocked the holy One, spit upon Him, and crowned Him with thorns, Jesus bore it all calmly, meekly, and patiently, yet with a holy, heavenly, and dignified bearing. O what a pattern, what an example for our imitation, when we are in the midst of trial, suffering, and provocation! Jesus was not filled with anger, but with unutterable sorrow, at the madness of the Jews.

And what shall we say as they hurry Him on, staggering beneath the weight of His cross, as the savage crowds yell out, "Crucify Him! Crucify Him!" For they did crucify him. And the blood-thirsty Pharisees and Sadducees had their revenge. The Lamb of God was bound for the sacrifice and they offered Him on the cross. His cup was now full, and in obedience to His Father's will He drank it. But oh, the weight—the curse of sin! It seemed as if the Father's face was turned aside—as if He had lost "the bosom of the Father;" and He cried, "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me." But for His enemies He said, "Father forgive them, they know not what they do." The sacrifice for our redemption was now offered. "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." With His dying voice He cried again, "It is finished." The earth heard that cry, and trembled with fear, yet desiring to shake off the curse of sin and death. The sun in horror hid his face from the awful scene, and nature shrank beneath the mantle of darkness. The king of glory is subjected to the lowest disgrace. But by this He conquered, and sin and death, the world and Satan, now lie prostrate at His feet; for He rose again the third day. He ascended to His glory and now pleads with us, "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."

IS FAITH A FAILURE?

By the Rev. R. C. NUGENT KELLY, M.A., English Chaplain at Gothenburg.

Sermon Preached at Gothenburg, on Sunday, November 18th, 1888.

"By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: For he looked for a city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. . . . . These all died in faith, not having received the promises."—Hebrews xi. 8, 9, 10, and 13.

THEY died, as they lived, in faith; yet they did *not* receive the promises. Is Faith, then, to be confessed a Failure? It is fashionable now to call everything "a failure;" life above all else. Now, in nine cases out of every ten, at least, life is more or less of a failure. It fails in securing all it hoped to have; it fails in all the little it hoped to do; it fails most especially in all that it might have been, because its hopes and aims too seldom rise to so lofty a plane as to seek being as the end at all. And now here is the Apostle, unaware of the tone of thought lurking in the dim distance of the nineteenth century, cutting the ground from under our feet by making the admission that Abraham, the father of the faithful, and all the other giants of faith, were deluded also. We are surprised against our will into asking, seriously and desperately: *Is Faith, then, a failure too?*

It is obviously certain that to this question, one standing where I now stand, will answer No. But it is one thing to deny an assertion, another thing to justify one's denial. Let that, then, be our task this morning.

We have had some strange upsettings in recent years of old beliefs. For instance, the rocks men always used to look upon as the very embodiment of unchangeableness and permanence, the sea as the type of change, and uncertainty, and unrest. Yet a man of weight—Huxley, I think—points out that the very reverse is true; in the course of time the rocks are *always changing*—it is the sea, and the sea alone, that is sure, and steadfast, and unalterable. So moreover is it with almost everything to which you apply close consideration. You read in the Scriptures that heaven and earth shall pass away—be rolled up, and cast aside as a garment that is done with, and yet to the eye the earth looks solid enough, the sun and the stars eternal.

But what does *Thought* teach? Thought looks more closely; looks below the outside impression, and lo! the whole aspect of nature is reversed. Every moment's sunshine makes the sun grow feebler; every day the earth draws nearer and nearer to its death, as surely as you and I are daily drawing nearer to ours. And to this the world's near neighbour and satellite—the moon—bears sure and solemn witness, for there you see the cold, icy hand of death displayed in the lifeless corpse of a former and once vigorous world. The things that are seen are not only "temporal," but to the last degree "temporary."

But Thought goes a step further. What is there behind all these perishing existences? *Force* is the answer. Now, mark, my friends, what we have reached; a vision such as atones by its magnificent inspiring beauty to many a hundred man of science for all the ills of life. The vegetable world changes every twelvemonth, more or less; it lives by dying. The human body changes entirely every seven years. The moment your body stops performing its due functions of regular systematic *dying*, it that moment ceases to be healthy, a paradox but a simple truth. The world under our feet, the rocks—even these primary rocks of Sweden, the oldest and surest yet known—these are things of everlasting change, as any may see for themselves in half-an-hour's walk this afternoon; the whole universe, in short, is passing through constant forms of change. But how? By the power of one thing that does *not* change, nor alter, nor can grow weak or weary—the law of *Force*. That "energy" is "conserved" intact, *and that alone*, through all the multifarious changes and chances of this mortal life. But that is just the very thing *you cannot see*. So we come back again to complete the Apostle's famous and never-dying declaration of the Law of the Universe: "the things which are *not seen* are *eternal*."

But what has all this got to do with Faith? Very much; very much, indeed. For rocks, and seas, and so forth, substitute "Human existence": for Force, the one thing which remains constant and unchangeable under all these changes, substitute "the power of the Life Divine"; and for "Thought" substitute "*Faith*," and then you have as true, as perfect, as unassailable a description of Faith and its results as you need wish to have.

But I have taken a signal instance of a man of Faith. Let us test it by his case.

Abraham believed that God called him to get out of his idolatrous surroundings, and to seek a new home; he went forth, not knowing whither he went. Presently there is added to his thoughts the hope of an inheritance in a particular corner of the world—the land of Canaan. Thither, obediently to God's will, he betakes himself. Now the promise was, that if he followed God's orders he should *have* that land to possess it. You find it in Genesis xii. First, "Get thee out of thy country . . . . unto a land that I will show thee." Then later, when he had crossed Jordan, "Unto thy seed will I give this land." Again, in the next chapter: "*All the land which thou seest*, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever." As a matter of fact, Abraham never had more property in land, there or anywhere else, than shall fall to the share of the poorest of us, probably, one of these days—six feet of mother earth, bought at market value, in which to lay his dead. "By faith he sojourned in the Land of Promise, *as in a strange country*, dwelling in tabernacles"; and at last he "*died* in faith, *not* having received the promises."

Now, it may fairly be asked, "Was not Faith clearly a Failure, in the case of Abraham at least?"

Let me turn to the illustration we took from Nature—God's awful book of unsullied truth. The student, first opening his eyes to the vastness of the great destruction ever going on around him, might exclaim, "Then there is nothing sure or steadfast." "Yes, there is," he will presently be answered—the force that destroys, itself cannot be destroyed. The things that are seen are temporal; the material universe. The things that are *not seen*, are eternal; the immaterial, invisible forces, which give form and shape to nature. So you may say that Abraham started in life with the expectation that God would establish him firmly in some part of Canaan. With that hope, and with that faith in God, he left home and kindred, and set out, not knowing whither he went; but knowing—and this is the point on which all this vast subject turns—knowing more surely than anything else, that he was *at that moment*, in his *present life*, led, directed, guided by the God whom he had believed.

But time goes on. Step by step he is led hither and thither, up and down "the Land of Promise," ever on the verge of rest, never securing it. Yet, step by step, day by day, he is learning the greatness of the *power* which moves his life. Little by little does all concern as to pastures and vineyards sink into the background, while the blessing of the Giver of pastures and vineyards grows more and more real. Stage by stage of his journey does it become more gloriously evident to him that the things that are seen are temporal; the things that are *eternal*—the possession for him and for his seed for *ever*—are the things that are *not seen*.

(The truth of this assertion you can easily test. I will just point out what appears to me to be the first evidence of the fuller hold on the *spiritual* interpretation of the promise: viz., the conduct of Abraham when the dispute arose with Lot as to their respective rights of pasture.)

This, the writer of the Hebrews also declares to be the nature of Abraham's faith. For he says that "he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God."

You observe then that here, as in so many other cases, the *spiritual man is prophetic.* He lives in a higher realm of thought, into which the rest of the world climb up ever so slowly and laboriously. "A city that hath foundations." Abraham, then, had found already what we are only *now* finding out, that "the fashion of this world passeth away." Faith, like thought, pierces the veil, sees the inner life; and the man of faith sees the *reality*, the *eternal truth and power* behind all the manifestations of it.

Now, when Mr. Huxley, say, has seen the magnificent vision of the eternal indestructible working of "energy" making those rocks and destroying them, forming worlds and wrecking them, he has got hold of the deepest possible truth their forms can express To him, then, it is nothing that the moon is dead, the earth dying; he sees the force which shall be stronger than death, and that sight absorbs all lesser thought. In like manner, when Abraham caught sight of the truth of the God-force in life, when he pierced the veil, and saw the greatness of the spiritual "city which *had* foundations," and contrasted it with the cities he knew — Damascus, Sodom, or any other — founded only on the soil of this world, he could afford to lose sight of the *forms* of blessing he had first expected, for he had its great reality. The surest establishment of himself as despot of the whole of Syria he would only have valued as a manifest illustration of the power, and goodness, and blessing of God; and having grasped the utmost fulness of these by *faith* he was content. He had the eternal reality of life sure; its temporal manifestations he took or left as they came.

For you must mark well that, while the Bible clearly shows that in no manner was the hope of the ownership of the acres of Canaan ever fulfilled, yet, at the same time, it clearly shows that Abraham was perfectly content. Indeed, it is manifest that the more clear it became that a literal interpretation of his early hope was not to be given him, yet the more calmly and happily did he trust himself to the promises of God. See this in the supreme moment of his faithful life. In Isaac were all his expectations and all God's promises centred; in that particular son and not another. Yet Abraham lived in such a real world of faith that he was perfectly sure that the fulness of the promise would be amply fulfilled, even if Isaac should be slain. It was a strain, and, perhaps, the result of a greatly strained faith; but it shows the hold which Abraham had on the *spiritual* interpretation of material promises.

Thus, friends, it is that God deals with the faithful in this life. Hope, such as you can understand, he sets before you. Nay, I will not say that. God sets before you *all* hopes, from the mean, selfish, mercenary hope of a Jacob, to the vision of Him who was in the bosom of the Father; all are set before you. And as you take what you have eyes to see, God leads you by that to see the next, and the higher, and better. A new country, a fresher, freer life was the first hope of Abraham. Said God, "Get thee up." He *believed* in that hope, and obeyed. Thereby he grew in grace, and was ready for the next revelation, the greater hope, until, at length, the earthly Canaan became but as the shadow of the truth; his heart was higher; he lived in the reality behind the words of promise; he was in full sight and in full membership of the "city which hath foundations." He walked with God, and was satisfied.

Obey, that is the condition of growth; obey what you *can* understand, and the rest shall come, that is the secret of Faith. It reveals the spirit of God working NOW. It shows the power of Christ Jesus, the Saviour, for the *present* need. It shows the eternal steadfast, abiding Law of the Will of God, working irrevocably *now*. So Faith gives meaning to the present moment. Indeed, I may say that the loftiness of Faith is in this, that it makes this hour full with all the fulness of eternity.

Just as it has been found that the only permanent thing in the universe is the force which is working in it, so do we come at last to see that the only abiding thing in our experience is the Will of God behind it all. And just as it is not the eye or the hand, but the steady application of *thought* which has laid hold on that physical truth, so is it, in like manner, the steady use of *faith* which has laid hold on that other and greater truth, "that God IS, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him."

"Have faith in God." That is the great end of life. Believe more fully, more absolutely, more trustingly. "The world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever."

Faith is *not* a Failure. Rather, in the wreck of all other human hopes, is its significance to be more gloriously displayed, its sureness more fully established, for Faith deals only with the things that cannot perish. Heaven and earth may pass away; they *shall* pass away; but the words of Eternal Truth shall not, because they *cannot* pass away. And Faith in its highest, best, and simplest form, is concerned only with one thing—that it may "know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent."

When you were very young, good friend, you saw an easy victory over the life before you. But you have since learned that roses have thorns; that there are giants in the Land of Promise; that even its vineyards need labour to cultivate. In many a way hope has shortened its hand. Let me ask you this plain, straightforward question: Is that which is good, that which is holy, less beautiful than it was of old? *Your* goodness and *your* holiness I do not speak about: they, I doubt not, are as ugly as my own; poor, miserable makeshifts. But you are not blind; you can still *see*—

by faith—what *perfectness* is? And that is still lovely, is it not? If men had not blurred the image of the great Christ you could find it in your heart to think Him no one whit less winning now than when you heard about Him at your mother's knee, long years ago. The mother's knee you have found, alas! to be but human. There is failure in your faith in that; but is Truth—the truth you first learned there—less powerful in itself? Is Love—the love that held you there—less a thing to be desired? Is the Holy God and His perfect Will less mighty, and awful, and grand? Is goodness less good? Is perfection less perfect? Nay, that they are not. But while man can see, and understand, and believe in Love, and Truth, and Holiness, so long can Faith never fail.

These are the pastures where the Shepherd would have you feed.

You hear the voice of Jesus first, perhaps, when He comes to you, seeking the lost and wandering sheep. The first word you can understand from Him, the first thought your faith can seize is, that He will forgive you your many sins. And you thank God, and take courage. But the Shepherd will so lead you—if you follow—into the highest heights of faith, that that first word—ever sweet, ever heart-stirring, ever rejoiced in, as Abraham may have rejoiced in the memory of the first call out of idolatrous Ur of the Chaldees, will yet lose its pre-eminence of isolation, for the Lord Jesus will show you all the mighty force of the Will of God in heaven and in earth; and "by faith" you shall so live in the company of the citizens of "the city which hath foundations," that you will scarce notice how little you have secured of the earthly hope of the earthly Land of Promise.

These are the realities of the realms to which Faith opens the way. These are the things eternal.

Brethren, may Christ "dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend, with all saints what is the breadth and depth, and length and height, and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." Amen.

DR. PERRY, formerly Bishop of Melbourne, and one of the Residentiary Canons of Llandaff Cathedral, has resigned his stall in consequence of ill health.

THE deanery of St. Asaph, vacant by the resignation of the Ven. H. A. James, Principal of Cheltenham College, has been offered to and accepted by the Rev. John Owen, M.A., Warden and Head Master of Llandovery College. Mr. Owen was a scholar of Jesus College, Oxford, where he obtained a Second Class in Classical and Mathematicel Moderations and a Second Class in Finals. He was ordained in 1879, and was formerly tutor and a Welsh Professor at St. David's College, Lampeter. During his wardenship at Llandovery College the number of the staff and of the pupils has largely increased.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly
CURED
by simply using the
AMMONIAPHONE
FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.
21s. post free.
WILL LAST FOR YEARS.
Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials may be had FREE OF CHARGE
on application to Medical Battery Co. Ltd.
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 1, 1889.

CHARITY NOT CHARITY.

THERE has been a time in the history of the Church when the means of relieving distress was altogether inadequate for the cases requiring help. Now, however, though there must always be many deserving cases which from one cause or another are not brought to light, we seem to have entered upon a time of such prodigal liberality to a certain class that it is difficult to say where it will end. The so-called poor, that is to say, those whose appearance is more or less disreputable, and whose inclination tend always rather to sloth than honest work, have every incentive to continue in the same course, whilst those whose respectability is a pronounced feature of their lives have many troubles to battle against, from which the former class is exempt. Indeed, the poor to-day need hardly trouble to think about earning a living, so much is done to help and support them. For instance, a man who, for the sake of argument, we suppose to possess that priceless treasure to the clever scamp, "the worst of bad characters," well knows that he needs but to play his cards well in order to secure quite sufficient to keep him in comparative comfort. If it suits him to get married he does so without the least fear of penury, for when the exchequer is low he has only to go with his wife to some benevolent person and inform him that he is not married, but desires to be so, when a genial shower of help is lavished upon him till the kind benefactor can "get them married," of course free of all cost—and then having exhausted all the patience and liberality of his patron, he has but to go to the next parish in order to ply his deceit again with equal success. According to the present

system such a man and woman need not be at all anxious about the support of their children. Many institutions exist for the express purpose of rearing and educating children whose parents do not wish to be at any expense on their behalf. If, on the other hand, the parents are desirous of keeping the children with them, the free breakfasts, free dinners and teas, which are so abundant in the poorer neighbourhoods, combined with the relief given for the sake of the children, is quite sufficient for their requirements. In order to procure clothing, for instance, it is only necessary to apply to the Poor Children's Aid Society and many kindred institutions to obtain a regular and valuable supply, while it is absolutely unnecessary even to think of paying anything for their education, so many are the means of procuring free education. But all this is not sufficient. The Christian and philanthropic public consider themselves bound to provide a pleasant holiday for other peoples' children, and so the "Children's country holiday fund" is brought into action, by means of which hundreds and thousands of parents are enabled to get rid of their children for various periods at a nominal cost to themselves, which is very often provided by well-meaning but deluded philanthropists. All these institutions in the abstract are admirable, but are in point of fact most fearfully abused, and tend in the aggregate rather to pauperise than to elevate the masses. We know a parish where more than £500 a year is given away annually, over which the clergy have no control, and where the result is most terrible. We feel it is our duty to raise our voice in protest against the multifarious and ill-advised charity which is a fruitful cause of much of the poverty of the present day. We believe that it would be a blessing to this country if all the charities were to be in abeyance for at least two years, for we firmly believe that the proportion of poverty during that period would be enormously lessened.

THE Rev. W. S. Ward has announced his intention of resigning the vicarage of Iver, near Uxbridge, in consequence of his age and infirmities, after having been the incumbent for fifty-four years, his father having previously held the living since 1803. For the past four years Mr. Ward has been afflicted with blindness, and has been obliged to depute the greater part of his duties to the curate-in-charge, the Rev. J. Stephens.

THE Bishop of Bedford and his council feel that they dare not take up any more new work at present, though many good openings lie before them, because the present liabilities of the East London Church Fund—£15,500—are greater than its estimated income for this year. Under these circumstances they feel especially grateful to the clergy and people of St. Peter's, Eaton-square, who responded to the sermons, preached on the 12th inst., with offertories amounting to £330, which included one cheque for £100 and two for £50.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION DAY.

MOST of us know the heavy feeling of sadness which seems to overspread our moral atmosphere when we have striven and failed. Doubtless we have all undertaken some task, to which we went with high hopes and have heart, and have not succeeded. Happily hope leads us on, and we soon forget our disappointments in fresh endeavours, and well it is that things can be so. To few comes the heavy trial that awaited the ignorant fisherfolk of Galilee. Poor, and unlearned for the most part, they had given up their business in life; they had literally "left all" and followed the Messiah, hoping that their self-denial would, in the end, be rewarded by the establishment of His Kingdom. Alas! for their short-sightedness, His Kingdom was *not* of this world; they had to hear and finally to *know* that He must leave them. We can well picture their hopeless grief; their bitter disappointment, though knowing the end so well, we can hardly sympathise fully in their distress. But the Master whom they had served, whom they had doubtless striven to understand, felt for them and provided a hope in their despair. He bade them look forward to the coming of One who should reveal Him more completely to them. He commanded them to wait for the bestowal of that Holy Spirit of God which should make possible the fulfilment of His promise—"Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' We have probably often thought that were our Lord only present with us in bodily form that we should be so much more able to serve Him well; we have shared the opinion that could He look at us from bodily eyes we should be ashamed to sin; we should be encouraged to Godliness. Christ knew us better, God understands us better than we do ourselves, and He said "it is *expedient* for you that I go away." Let us, then, not indulge in useless fancies; let us believe His word, and pray "send us thine Holy Ghost to comfort us." Our fervent prayer will be answered: we shall learn as we could never have learnt otherwise, "the deep things of God." Our minds shall be enlarged and purified, so that we shall — in *this* life, spiritually, as in *that* life entirely—be exalted "unto the same place whither our Saviour Christ is gone before."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE CAUSE OF ALL OUR DIVISIONS.—NO. III.

SIR,—I have tried to show that all these proceed from ignorance of the Catechism or Sacraments.

I trust I have proved, as to baptism, that, with the water as a means, comes God's pardon and adoption of adult and infant, an instantaneous act of His, as opposed to conversion, a gradual work, in which the subject must take a willing part.

2. I now come to the other sacrament, in which bread and wine are the means, on God's part, as faith, etc., are on ours. Bread and wine are got rid of on the Romish side, because only the appearances remain;

and on the Zuinglean side, because faith is made the only intervening medium between God and the soul. If I can prove that bread and wine are the means, while their nature is unchanged, my work will be done.

3. Passing over the first answer—as to which all are agreed—I come to the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper. "Bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received." This contradicts the Romish and Ritualist theory, that bread and wine vanish, leaving only appearances, etc. But this point is made more plain by the answer to the last question but one, "What are the benefits, etc.?" "The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine." Will any say that our bodies could be strengthened and refreshed by mere appearances, look, smell, etc., of bread and wine? Unless the solid substance of bread and wine remain, it is impossible that our bodies could be strengthened and refreshed by them. And, as our souls are strengthened only in the same manner, both effects become worthless and illusory.

4. But we come now to the great *crux* of all—the inward part or thing signified. Answer: "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." How are the Body and Blood present? Not materially, for that is denied by the 4th Article, as well as by the Black Rubric. Further, "This is my Body, slain or broken, and my Blood shed," cannot be taken literally, for His Body slain and His Blood shed from His Veins do not in that state now exist, that they should be extended to us. Nothing exists but the living glorified Body. Neither did they exist even when our Lord spake the words. The literal meaning, then, must be given up. But St. Paul explains the words for us: "The bread which we break, is it not the κοινωνία, or communication of the Body?" What is communicated cannot be the material Body, which is in heaven alone; and therefore what is communicated, if anything, can be only blessing or grace for the strengthening and refreshing of our souls. If it is a violent expression for grace—"the Body of Christ"—it is St. Paul's, and not ours. And it is only analogous to my saying, I sit in the sun, or, The sun is on my room or garden. At any rate, there is no other explanation, but one more violent still, namely, that all that is meant is that it is a figure or memorial of His Body. It is better to say, "The expression, the sun is on my room," means its effects are here, than that it only implies, this is a picture of the sun, or a memorial of last summer's heat.

5. The faithful alone benefit by reception, though others partake of the outward part. God means to do *all* good by sacraments, as by sermons, Bible, etc., but the impenitent place an *obex* in the way.

The meaning of the 29th Article is misunderstood. It is directed against the dogma of the Schoolmen, that grace is received in the Eucharist, even by those who want faith and charity. I quote from Dr. Vogan, p. 529 ("The True Doctrine of the Eucharist,' London, 1871) . The Schoolmen say—God, the principal cause (*causa principalis*), causes grace always, and to all who do not place a bar. Observe, it is not "*habentibus*," but "*ponentibus obicem*," which must mean, "who do not set a wilful hindrance," who do not wilfully reject or refuse the grace. See Moehler's "Symbolism," i. 288. God is the *operans* . . . the *recipient* is not necessarily *operans*, but the *subjectum capax* operated upon. He is necessarily but passive: admitting the grace, as a cup receives the wine poured into it. If he has faith and charity so much the better, and the more fruitful the sacrament is to him; but, if he does not wilfully and purposely reject it, he receives it *ipso facto* and *ex operor operato*. As De la Hogue expresses it: "*Ex ipsâ ritus externi efficacia* (*gratia*) *tanquam ex foute, defluit in subjectum*," as from a fountain grace flows into the subject. "The Sacraments," iv.; Dublin, 1828-30.

6. I now come to those who deny that the bread and wine are a means, on God's part, of conveying grace, as faith, etc., are a means on our part of receiving it. This is scarcely worth notice, as the definition of a sacrament makes it necessary that the outward part, the bread and wine, should be the means ordained by Christ for our receiving the grace, and a pledge that we do receive it. It would be needless to press what is self-evident, but that a new question and answer have been thrust into the Irish Catechism with intent to make bread and wine no means on God's part, and to reduce the whole thing to man's act of faith, grasping what God does not stretch out. This is so directly contrary to the definition of a sacrament, that one wonders that any one, or body of men, should thrust it into the Catechism, without erasing the contradictory definition of a sacrament. If bread be not the means, the Eucharist has only one part, and therefore, according to the 28th Article, it is no sacrament at all.

7. It is distressing to have to add that this question and answer thrust into the Catechism are announced in the New Preface in language directly contrary to the truth. It is said that *both* are taken from the Article. It was, twice over, promised in "The Revision Report of 1871," that they should be *both so taken*. But, in truth, the question is taken from the Catechism, because "given and eaten," which are abhorred, are not found there; and it is only the answer that is taken from the Articles, with the other form, "taken and received."

8. A leading Ritualist in Dublin diocese told a meeting of young clergy, "We can make nothing of the Catechism." This is a dignitary who poses for a great gun, a master in Israel. Yet he cannot understand the alphabet of religion! What must be his Sunday-school teachers trained by him? what the children taught by them? *Horresco referens!* At any rate, he is honest. Would that he would still even now go to school and learn the alphabet! But he is honest compared with his English *confrères*, who maintain that the 28th Article does not condemn transubstantiation, though it does so *by name*, and explains it as "*the change of the substance*." These honest men tell us that the bread and wine become, in substance, the Body and Blood of Christ; yet that this is not what the Article condemns. See Lewington on "Doctrine of the Real Presence," Ox. Mowbray, 1871, p. 9.

9. I trust I have now explained the Catechism on the two Sacraments. It must not be frittered away so as to make Baptism a mere form. In the Eucharist, bread must be a means as well as faith. Again, the Eucharist must not be made out to have only one part, and that a solid Body to be adored, as Rome has it. Neither is it to be held, as Zuingle does, a mere figure of a thing totally absent, or a mere memorial of an event past. As things are now, it is no wonder that we are split into a hundred parties.

The only cure is to stick to the Catechism, the alphabet of our faith. That will keep us free from Rome, on one hand, and from Zuingle, or infidelity, on the other.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. & V.-G. of Kildare.

April 20th, 1889.

THE USE OF THE APOCRYPHA.

SIR,—I observed with some surprise in the PULPIT of May 25th, a sermon on Heredity based on the writings of the son of Sirach. Now, though with the "judicious Hooker" we are to regard the Apocrypha as the "marginal border of the Old Testament," and read the same "for example of life and instruction of manners," yet we may not "apply them to establish any doctrine." Far be it from me to find fault with the doctrine of the sermon in question, but I would merely submit to the consideration of your readers this point, that the main thought of the subject of the Rev. George Bladon could have been as well deduced from Deut. vi. 6, 7, a passage which was quoted in the sermon, or from Prov. xxii. 6. But since the Apocrypha is never appointed for the Sunday Lessons, and only appears in the Prayer Book in the Benedicite and Offertory Sentences, I should not have said we were authorised to preach upon it.

JOHN CHRISTIE.

Barnwood, Gloucester, May 28th, 1889.

THE MINISTRY OF EVIL.

SIR,—I am sorry that "J. B." should find it necessary to observe "that I do not quote the words of an opponent fairly." I am more sorry that he regards himself as an opponent. I claim to be a humble seeker after truth. I hoped he was so, too. But let us see wherein I have erred.

He makes this observation ". . . . it is the firm purpose of God to deliver all intelligent creation from evil through the superior energy of moral good." I interpret this, "All intelligent creation will become good. . . ." "J. B." objects to my interpretation. He gives no reason. May I ask your readers if the interpretation is not a just one? Of course, when it leads over a precipice, obviously enough, it is only what we may expect that the writer should exclaim. But the fault is not mine.

He also objects to my interpreting his "flashing" conviction as a momentary operation, and yet proceeds himself to compare it to the vividness of lightning, accompanied by a luminous chain of texts. What a jargon is here! I think I may fairly suggest to "J. B." that, however clear his ideas may be to his own mind, he has not succeeded in presenting them clearly to ours. Without proceeding to an analysis of the various types of mind, we may fairly assume that there are those who go straight to a truth without any process of reasoning, and that there are others again who reason out all their truths. Many have intuitions. But "J. B." represented himself, as I understood him, as reasoning long and then being suddenly convinced. But I am not quite sure that all this is not mere quibbling, and that I ought to have contented myself with merely pointing out that the expression was not felicitous.

I must ask for an explanation of the following: "I accept the mysterious fact that multitudes of those who calmly, serenely and even almost joyfully anticipate endless misery in the universe, profess a fervent belief in the Sovereignty of God, and the heart-stirring proclamation, "God is love." Who are they—name one—who almost joyfully anticipate the endless misery? Failing proof, I must describe the foregoing as a caricature of solemn truths. Of course, I should be prepared to receive harder names after this; but that is of little consequence.

I do not wish that "J. B." should remain in doubt as to my meaning, so I will try to make the two positions quite clear. (1) The evil in the evil tends to develop good in the evil. (2) There will be a universal reclamation through the evil of all the evil in the universe. "J. B." will not know how to harmonise these things with his theories; but they are the logical outcome of what he has advanced. I shall be prepared to show him this quite clearly.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, May 25th, 1889.

A SUM has been anonymously presented to the vicar of St. German's, Cardiff, sufficient to endow the church in perpetuity with £150 a year.

AT the close of the morning service at York Minster on Thursday last, the Dean, accompanied by Canon Raine and Mr. H. A. Hudson, the diocesan registrar, proceeded to the Chapter-house and formally prorogued Convocation until the 20th June.

THE election of a clergyman by household suffrage took place on Saturday last at Birmingham. In 1383 Richard III. granted an endowment of a little over £6 a year to the Church of St. John, and this was increased as years went on until it is now of the value of £450 per annum, and in a few years the income will be greatly increased, owing to the falling in of leases. Since the fourteenth century the chaplains, as they are termed, of St. John's, have always been elected by the householders, the deed prescribing each person having a hearth, so that the franchise is similar to that of a municipal election, including women voters. The last election took place in 1870, and the present vacancy was created by the retirement of the then successful candidate. Five candidates entered the field out of about fifty applications, but only three went to the poll. These were the Rev. C. J. Sneath, curate of St. Paul, Balsall-heath; the Rev. J. O. West, curate of Christ Church, Sparkbrook; and the Rev. L. H. Davies, of Blackpool, described respectively as High Church, Evangelical, and Broad. There are nearly twenty thousand voters in the hamlets, which comprise the greater part of the two Parliamentary divisions of Bordesley and South Birmingham. There were seventeen polling stations. The election being by open voting took place amidst unusual excitement, and as the Corrupt Practices Act does not apply, it is said that a large amount of treating took place. Mr. West, being a total abstainer, received the support of the temperance party, whilst Mr. Sneath, having avowed himself in favour of moderate drinking, was actively supported by the publicans and brewers. Betting, it is also stated, took place on an extensive scale. The result was declared about eight o'clock by Mr. Alderman Johnson, the returning officer, as follows:—West, 6,072; Sneath, 5,038; Davies, 167. Majority for West 1,034. The declaration was received with opposing manifestations by an enormous crowd which had assembled in Deritend.

LORD MOUNT-EDGCUMBE has given a donation of £20 to the Truro Diocesan Society for the Augmentation of Small Livings.

FATHER PUDNEY, late parish priest of Glyntaff Roman Catholic Church, near Cardiff, has, it is said, seceded and joined the Church of England.

MR. JOHN BOROUGH, of Derby, has been appointed to the office of registrar of the diocese of Southwell, rendered vacant by the death of Mr. John Watson, of Nottingham. The *Derby Mercury* understands that the registry will shortly be removed from Nottingham to Derby. The offices of registrar and secretary to the Bishop will be separated for the future.

THE tenth annual meeting of the Rochester Diocesan Society was held in Sion College Hall on Monday last under the presidency of the Bishop of the diocese. The report, after alluding to the fact that the society sought to minister to the needs of a population of nearly 2,000,000, said the living agents supported were fourteen clergymen, one deaconess, thirty Scripture-readers, and fifty-three Mission-women. It was eminently a home Mission agency encouraging new enterprises, and aiding the formation of Mission districts in over-grown parishes. Last year the amount subscribed was £8,599, as compared with £8,150 in the previous year.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Askwith, Rev. E. H., Assistant-Master of Westminster School; Head Master of the South-Eastern College, Ramsgate.
Beynon, Rev. F. W., Vicar of Alfriston, Sussex.
Broughton, Rev. Reginald Edmund, M.A., Vicar of Prestbury.
Buckham, Rev. F. H., Vicar of Kirkby Grindalythe, Yorkshire; Vicar of Sledmere.
Chavasse, Rev. F. J., Vicar of St. Peter-le-Bailey, Oxford; Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.
Clark, Rev. Thomas Edward, M.D., Perpetual Curate of Pott Shrigley.
Cochrane, Rev. David Crawford, M.A., Master of Etwall Hospital, and Rector of Dalbury; Vicar of Etwall.
Cowan, Rev. G. D., Curate of Holy Trinity, Dalston; Curate-in-Charge of St. John's, Cubitt-town, Poplar.
Curry, Rev. John George, B.A., Rector of Holy Trinity, Southwark.
Davies, Rev. Arthur David, M.A., Curate of St. Chad's, Rochdale; Rector of St. Michael's, Bamford.
De Carteret, Rev. Reginald Thomas, Chaplain of Neuilly.
Dowling, Rev. Theodore E., late Rector of Christ Church, St. Stephen, New Brunswick, Canada; Society for the Propagation of the Gospel Chaplain, Oran, Algeria.
Girdlestone, Rev. Canon, Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford; Perpetual Curate of St. John's, Hampstead.
Guest, Rev. Thomas Hill, M.A., Rector of St. Mark's, Hulme, Manchester; Vicar of Poulton-le-Fylde, Lancaster,
Highmoor, Rev. Wilson, Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Anson*.
Higson, Rev. Harry, Curate of Christ Church, Pendlebury; Curate-in-Charge of Tain, Ross-shire.
Jones, Rev. A. Emlyn, Secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society for the Diocese of Llandaff.
Jones, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of Llywel; Rector of Penboyr, Carmarthenshire.
Kidston, Rev. John Wallace, M.A., Rector of Weyhill, Hants.
Lightfoot, Rev. John, L.Th., Curate of Bothal; Rector of Ashington, Northumberland.
Lloyd, Rev. John, B.A., First or Head Minister of St. Paul's, Liverpool.
Mant, Rev. Newton, Vicar of Sledmere, East Yorks; Vicar of St. Luke's, New Chesterton, Cambridge.
Mercer, Rev. J. E., Curate of the Rossal School Mission, All Saints', Newton Heath, Manchester; Rector of St. Michael's, Angel Meadow.
Mitchell, Rev. John Francis, Rector of Wolferton, Norfolk; Hon. Chaplain to the Queen.
Moriarty, Rev. James H., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Volage*.
Nash, Rev. T. A., Canon, Rector of Lowestoft; Rector of Little Wenlock, Shropshire.
Owen, Rev. John, M.A., Warden and Head Master of Llandovery College; Dean of St. Asaph.
Scott, Rev. I. C. R., B.A. Dunelm., Curate of Fenton; Vicar of Penkhull.
Scott, Rev. John Holford, M.A., Vicar of Headington, Oxon.
Skey, Rev. Frederic C., M.A., Principal of St. Mary Magdalene's Choir College, Paddington.
Skrine, Rev. Vivian Eccles, M.A., Rector of Dingley, Northamptonshire.
Smartt, Rev. W. H., Rector of St. Paul's, Heaton Moor, near Stockport.
Spencer, Rev. T. Barton, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Preston; Grand Chaplain of England in Freemasonry.
Sturges, Rev. Arthur Smith, M.A., Vicar of Wheatley, Oxon.
Tonge, Rev. G., Vicar of Christ Church, Sparkbrook, Birmingham; Secretary of the Church of England Zenana Missionary Society.
Troutbeck, Rev. Dr. J., Minor Canon of Westminster and Priest-in-Waiting at the Chapel Royal, St. James's Palace; Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen.
Tweedie, Rev. A. G., Vicar of Ranmoor, Sheffield; Vicar of Selby, Yorkshire.
Venables, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Scofton-with-Osberton, Worksop, Notts; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Nottinghamshire.
Walpole, Rev. G. C., Curate of Amberley; Vicar of West Wittering, Chichester.
Ward, Rev. Clement C., Curate of St. Margaret's, Dunham Massey; Rector of Whittington, Chesterfield.
West, Rev. Austin, Vicar of Allestree, Derbyshire.
Whittuck, Rev. S. H. P., Senior Curate of Bath Abbey; Vicar of Heywood, Wilts.
Wilson, Rev. J. A., M.A., Rector of Bolton-by-Bowland; Honorary Canon in Ripon Cathedral.
Wintle, Rev. Richard Prior, Perpetual Curate of St. Mary's, Frome.
Wollocombe, Rev. J. H. B., Vicar of Lamerton, near Tavistock.
Wood, Rev. Canon, Incumbent of Headingley, Leeds; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.
Wood, Rev. Samuel George, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Threapwood, Malpas.
Worthington, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Northlew, Devon; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Staffordshire.
Wright, Rev. C. N., Rector of Brompton, Patrick-with-Hunton, Yorkshire.
Wynn-Griffith, Rev. R. R., B.A., Incumbent of St. Andrew's, Walsall.
Yule, Rev. Charles J. F., M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Curate of Alcester, Warwickshire; Vicar of Horspath, Oxfordshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Chandler, Rev. Henry William, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College, and Wayneflete Professor of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, at Pembroke College, Oxford, on the 16th ult., aged 61.
Eden, Rev. Robert, at Swalecliffe Rectory, on the 22nd ult., aged 53.
Eicke, Rev. Kenneth Macaulay, Officiating Chaplain at Karachi, India, on the 24th ult.
Hanson, Rev. Stephen, M.A., Rector of Weeting, late Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge, at 61, Warwick Gardens, Kensington, W., on the 23rd ult., aged 64.
Hill, Rev. Francis Thomas, late Vicar of Terling, at 20, Montpelier Villas, Brighton, on the 23rd ult., aged 86.
Lloyd, Rev. William, M.A., for sixty-four years Rector of Lillingstone Lovell, on the 24th ult., aged 89.
Marsh, Rev. William, for thirty-six years Vicar of the Parish, at the Manor House, Wethersfield, on the 24th ult., aged 74.
Sanctuary, Rev. Thomas, Archdeacon of Dorset, and Canon-residentiary of Salisbury, at the Vicarage, Powerstock, on the 27th ult., aged 66.
Stanton, Rev. Joseph John, Rector of North and South Barrow, at Holton House, Somerset, on the 19th ult., aged 57.
Wright, Rev. William, LL.D., Sir T. Adam's Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, and Fellow of Queen's College, on the 22nd ult.
Young, Rev. Cecil Beadon, Vicar of Cobham, at Cobham, Surrey, on the 27th ult.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CHRISTIAN PASSOVER.

By the Rev. J. W. KAYE, M.A., Rector of Derrybrusk, Enniskillen.

A Communion Sermon Preached in Derrybrusk Parish Church, on Sunday, May 5th, 1889.

"Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lamp, even as ye are unleavened. For our Passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ: wherefore let us keep the feast, not with the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."—1 Cor. v. 7-8 (R.V.).

OUR sublime solar system, whether viewed in relation to the world in which we "live and move and have our being," or viewed in relation to the starry firmament around us, displays unquestionable marvels of power, wisdom, and beneficence. The sweeping rivers, the towering mountains, the rolling oceans of this our globe, all bear marks indelible of the might and majesty of their Maker. But what are these compared with the magnificent constellations that move in harmonious revolutions through the infinitude of stellar space? Do not all these bear the impress of their Creator—God? How stupendous are those vast masses of conglomerate matter which form the suns and stars of those immense systems which adorn the heavens upon which we nightly gaze! Did these all come by chance? Are these beautifully constructed and revolving worlds the result of "The fortuitous concourse of atoms?" Men talk of "The laws of nature" as though a law were either a power or a living entity. It is no more than a mode of action which an operating will or will-force chooses to adopt. The infinite will-force behind all things is God's will operating. Yet "Men by wisdom know not God." God made His glory to shine forth in His works; but man's intelligence did not lead him to that effective knowledge of God, which should have inspired living communion with Him. God in His Providence showed man how feeble a creature man is at his best. The world tried its own wisdom and tested its own capacities, yet it found not out the Almighty. But God was pleased, by progressive revelation, by types and shadows, and "By the foolishness of preaching" to teach mankind, and "To save them that believe." God chose the seed of Abraham, made covenants with men, sent His prophets, and in "The fulness of time, gave His only begotten Son." The Son of God was the great antitype, in whom all the types and shadows were fulfilled. He stooped from His glory, became incarnate, preached the Gospel, revealed the Father, and gave Himself a sacrifice for us. Thus He was crucified, the Just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God. The Baptist exclaimed when he saw Him, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." For He is the true Paschal Lamb, whose shed blood delivers from more than Egyptian bondage. Our text reminds us of that great typical event in Jewish history, which has its counterpart and complete fulfilment in Christ and Christianity. The world of sinners are in "Egyptian bondage"; the Paschal Lamb has been slain for the sin of the world; and God has a people for whom the Lamb's sprinkled blood has availed and is availing. Christians are required to keep continual festival—a life holyday unto the Lord. But even in the Christian Church tares sometimes grow among the wheat; and sometimes the old leaven of malice and wickedness will find its way and work mischief among Christians. Let us consider more fully the Apostle's injunctions.

I. The Putting away of the Old Leaven.—It was the custom of the Israelites to remove the leaven away from their houses before the Passover began; even as the lamb was chosen four days before it was slain. On the fourteenth day of the month, even on the day of the Passover, the houses in Jerusalem were minutely searched lest any leaven should remain. And does not Christianity and the very nature of things require repentance to precede forgiveness, and faith to precede acceptance. Came not Jesus Himself "preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the Gospel." The unrepentant sinner, whose heart is full of "the leaven of malice and wickedness," cannot truly feed on the "flesh" and "blood" of Christ; nor hold spiritual communion with Him. The Church of Christ cannot receive into its communion, nor admit to its ordinances, the man who lives in sin and open immorality.

"The old leaven" of sin and corruption must be purged out. The Church must maintain a salutary discipline which shall separate between the moral and the immoral, the just and the unjust, the righteous and profane. Sin must not be allowed to reign in the heart, neither must evil be allowed to grow rampant in the Church. "Purge out the old leaven," said the Apostle, "as ye are (called to be) unleavened." Christians are called to be pure, and to live in "sincerity and truth." Their pattern is Christ, and their ideal is to be like Christ. "Christ our Passover is sacrificed;" and we have redemption and sanctification through Him, therefore let us put away sin from our hearts. We cannot ignore guilt, neither can we condone impurity. Sin may try to hide itself in the recesses of the heart, but it must be hunted away. We "cannot

serve God and Mammon." Leaven was not allowed to remain in the houses in Jerusalem during the feast, neither can it be permitted to remain in the Church of Christ, for she keeps perpetual feast on His broken body and shed blood. We now turn to the next portion of our subject—

II. The Eating "the Body of the Lamb."—The Jewish Paschal Lamb was sacrificed year by year, but "Christ our Passover was sacrificed" once for all.

The Passover of the Jews was not only a commemoration of the deliverance from Egyptian bondage and heathenism, but it was also a sacrificial rite. In Exodus xii. 27 it is distinctly called a "sacrifice." It was a sacrifice both of expiation and dedication, in which the sacrificer realised by faith true spiritual communion with God. And thus the Israelites were taught that only by an atonement could they draw near to God and be accepted of Him. In this act of reconciliation they received by faith new supplies of spiritual strength, as the eating of the flesh of the lamb gave them bodily strength. Both the sacrifice and its ritual typified and shadowed forth another offering of One who would not only make them clean ceremonially, but would "purge their conscience from dead works to serve the living God." Jesus superseded and fulfilled the Passover of the Jews by becoming Himself the sacrifice. Hence He said, "Except ye eat of my flesh, and drink of my blood, ye have no life in you." And again He said, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day" (St. John vi. 54). The Aramaic language was highly poetical, and was spoken in Babylonia and Assyria during the captivity of the Jews; and portions of the Old Testament are written in this tongue.

With this language the Jews returned to their own land, and Aramaic became the vernacular dialect spoken in Judea. There is no doubt that our Lord spoke both Aramaic and Greek. But Greek was the language of the higher and educated classes, while Aramaic was the language of the common people.

One great peculiarity of this Aramaic language is, that it has no word meaning "to signify," "to represent." Thus the people amongst whom our Lord associated, to whom He preached, and from among whom He chose His twelve Apostles, habitually said, "This is," and *not* "This signifies." But even in Moses' times, when the Israelites were in the wilderness, or when they had reached the land of Canaan, when their children asked them, saying, "What mean ye by this service?" They replied, "It is the Lord's Passover" (Exodus xii. 27). It was the custom also, at the yearly eating of the Passover to say, "This is the body of the Paschal Lamb which our fathers ate in Egypt." Hence our Lord used the ordinary language of the people when He said "This is My body," and "This is My blood." Thus the bread and the wine at the Lord's Supper represent to us the broken body and the shed blood of Christ our Paschal Lamb. Even the national character of the Passover finds its fulfilment in the communion of all true Christians, and in "their fellowship with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ." For the Apostle St. Peter says, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifice, acceptable to God by Christ Jesus." And again he said, "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people." The bond of Christian love unites the whole Christian Church, and inspires it with the same affections, the same hopes, the same holy aspirations and purposes. But we have yet to consider

III. The Keeping the Festival.—The language of the Apostle is, "Let us keep festival," or holyday. "For our Passover was sacrificed (once for all) even Christ; therefore let us keep festival," or holyday continually. In the perpetuation of the Passover, the Jews were taught that there was something more required of them than the mere slaying and roasting of the lamb; it was to be eaten with thankfulness and joy. The heart was to be filled with thanksgiving, in grateful remembrance, (1) that God had spared them when the Egyptians were slain; (2) that God had delivered them from slavery and heathenism; (3) that God had chosen them as His high people and consecrated them to His service. And now the Passover is fulfilled, not only in the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, but in the thankful acceptance and appropriation of that sacrifice by us for our redemption from the bondage of sin. And thus the Christian's life is to be a continual festival, and a continual feeding by faith on the broken body and shed blood of Christ. The yearning souls of devout Jews were filled year by year with loving hope, looking for the coming of the prophet greater than Moses, who would bring them a more glorious deliverance than that from Egypt, and give them a kingdom of might and magnificence far exceeding the land of Canaan. And now "Christ has appeared once in the end of the world, to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." And having ascended into heaven, He "sat down on the right hand of God," for "in Him the Father is well-pleased," and by Him we may "offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually." And though trials and troubles may often press hard upon our souls, yet "in Him we have peace." He gave us words of comfort to cheer our drooping hearts. "In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." And again He said, "To him that overcometh, I will grant to sit with Me in My throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with My Father in His throne." Therefore let us keep the "festival" with holy joy and gladness; with "the unleavened bread of sin-

cerity and truth"; and let the seven days be to us the symbol of a consecrated life. And let us purge out "the old leaven of malice and wickedness," and daily rise with Christ to newness of life. Let us forsake every evil way; let us live to God; let us consecrate ourselves to His service. Hear the words of the Apostle, "Ye are not your own; ye are bought with a price," even the precious blood of Jesus Christ. Oh what a power; what a blessedness there is in a consecrated life. Then we are Christ's and Christ is ours. "Old things are passed away and all things are become new." Nay more, "For all things are yours; whether life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

DEFINITENESS.

By the Rev. R. C. NUGENT KELLY, M.A., English Chaplain at Gothenburg.

Sermon Preached at Gothenburg, on Quinquagesima Sunday, 1889.

"What wilt thou that I shall do unto thee?"—St. Luke xviii. 41.

THERE is something humbling in the thought that our Blessed Lord, who came with the right to take our service, so constantly, nay! so unceasingly, lays aside all His claims to ask, What wilt *thou?* of those who should have served Him. You are by the Gospel summoned to the loving and loyal service of your God. Yet how often does the Master forego His claim to ask what service He shall render you? So be it, then. Instead of offering to serve Him, let us cry to Him to serve us. Yet even to that greeting will the meek and lowly One turn Himself. He will gladly serve where He ought to command. Nay, He serves us all before He lays one command upon us.

We, then, hearing the fame of the Saviour King, join the throng who confess their admiration of Him, and bewail themselves as "miserable sinners;" we say, "Lord help, have mercy," with the rest of them. For the power of God we by no means despise; nay, we think it were well if we were somewhat holier than we are. We think true religion most beauteous and desirable; we only wish we had more of it in us! We pray earnestly at times for greater grace, and better lives, and firmer faith; as others do. Our cry mingles with the great voice which ever ascends from the struggling souls of earth to the merciful ears of the most merciful Saviour, and *then Christ turns, He singles out your individual voice* from the great multitude who confess their need and ask His help. "You cry to me," He says, "what, then, is it that thou wilt have?" "*What* wilt thou that I shall do unto thee?"

Would such a question find you puzzled, friend? I fear it is possible. I fear there are many who pray God "to deliver them from evil," and yet take good care to run no risk of having their prayers answered! And perhaps there are more who think it well and right to ask God day by day for help and guidance, yet could find not one clear definite word to say in reply if the Lord pressed them close with His question, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?

On Wednesday next we begin the season of Lent. Now let us not *play* at Religion like children. But I do, with all earnestness and anxiety, beg of you to make some use of a season so happily ordered for us. I can say, for I know it, that an honest attempt to use this season well; to seek God's face in it, if not more earnestly, yet at any rate in a more special manner, meets with very special blessing. It is not good to be always weighing up ourselves, and counting our sins, yet it is still worse never to do this. It is very good at such a time as this to "examine yourselves whether you repent you truly of your former sins; and wherein-soever ye shall perceive yourselves to have offended, either by will, word, or deed, there to bewail your own sinfulness, and to confess yourselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment of life. Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord."

Yes, judge therefore yourselves, brethren. Surely it is not self-respectful even; (I say no more than that): it is not becoming to the dignity, the due and proper dignity, of manhood, that we should be utterly ignorant of ourselves. And yet how common is this ignorance. The years go by, one after another; God's grace follows us year after year; time after time does the Son of Man, rich in mercy and power, pass by us on the road of life; we read, we pray, we strive; we come together, here and elsewhere, "in the Name of the Lord Jesus;" yes, we are honestly dissatisfied with the extent of our attainments in the Christian life; and yet *we are content to be dissatisfied*, content to be ignorant of ourselves. The power of the Gospel, as represented in us, seems to come to a standstill. What, then, hinders? I think I dare to answer. Is it not this? we don't *want* to grow; we don't *want* to be perfect; we dislike it. When the Master speaks to *all* men, then we hear; when *all* men throng and press Him, we will gladly join in; when men confess their sins together, we lay ourselves in the dust too, *with the rest;* when the hymns are sung and the prayers are prayed, and the words are uttered about heaven and heavenliness of mind, then we think it beautiful—for somebody else! But, brother Christians, how do you answer when Christ says to you singly, you yourself: "What wilt thou have Me to do for thee?"

There is the testing question I would urge you to listen to daily through this season: What is you look for when you come to church on Sun-

days? Do you want help and strength from God? Yes? But what kind of help? and strength for what task? *Is there any real definite wish you have* when you ask for grace? *Definiteness* is the point. *Definiteness* is what we abhor when dealing with God: *definiteness* is what alone makes our dealings with God real.

When our Lord first began His miracles of help and grace, He used, you will notice, to give the grace at once; but later, He always interposed some such question. He asks the blind man at Jericho, so as to have the issue clear and definite: "What wilt thou that I shall do unto thee?" Prompt and emphatic, and most definite is this sinner's answer: Lord! that I may receive my sight. That was what he wanted; that he asked for; that he firmly expected; and that, precisely that he got.

Now let us take this question of the Lord Jesus; this question in which He so humbly and graciously offers to serve us, and see what answers we are giving Him. You say, perhaps, Would that I had not sinned; would that I had that consciousness of guilt taken off my mind! "My Son," says the Lord, in reply, "what is this burden of thine? What wilt thou? Shall I take it from thee?" Friend, what do you answer? There is thy Saviour, ready to say now, at this moment: "Thy sins be forgiven thee; cast them from thee." And you? what say you? You greatly want your sins forgiven. Yes! *but you, perhaps, want your pride of heart a little more;* is that it? So be it, then; according to thy faith be it unto thee; the Lord can pass on again, if you will. Just exactly, precisely, and to the uttermost, as *you* decide will He do in this matter. He has *prepared* forgiveness—will *you have it?* There then stand, face to face with your Christ, and know yourself! Answer Him as He asks you, "What is it that thou wilt have?"

Or you say, perhaps: I wish I was more firm in my Christian life; I wish my feet did not so readily slip from under me in this most treacherous ground. "What wilt thou?" asks the Lord Jesus. "Strength of foot and more solid ground? Here it is—*by my side.*" Yes, friend, you know it; you know it in your heart, as surely as the Lord Himself knows it, who reads all hearts; you know full well that if you would step up to the higher ground—if you would more fully share the cross of Christ, and walk more boldly and more openly as His disciple, that then your feet would *not* stumble, and for the clay of earthliness you would find the rock of substantial principle and truth under your feet. But you don't want it; you don't want (you positively shrink from the idea), you don't want to be more of a Christian than the run of men. So when Christ desires to single you out, and desires to serve you, and to answer your prayers, and to give you the fuller grace, and make you a truer Christian; why! you are most terribly alarmed; you dread to think of your words of pious aspiration being taken literally; you can only beg Him to "depart out of your coasts." Ah! it's a dreadful thing, this definiteness; it crushes so brutally all our little plausible vanities to nothing.

So the Lord has to pass *you* by, too. But there are others here, as elsewhere, who say: Yes; the Gospel is very noble and grand; but, do what I will, there are some sins I fall into again and again. I would to God I could be free from them! Then comes the merciful Saviour, and hearing your prayer and your earnestness, He turns aside from the throng and offers to help you. But first, as ever, He asks you to say clearly what you want to be freed from? And then you discover alas! alas! it is by no means true what you thought: you don't want to be delivered from those sins at all — you love them. A man prays God to forgive him for his sin and to deliver him from the temptation, say, of drunkenness: and then makes not the slightest change in his living. Another prays to be kept from the love of the world, and to be made more spiritually minded—and then watches the fluctuations of the money market with an eagerness and zest unknown to him in searching the things of God. What miserable hypocrisy! How much better to say outright: Lord I *don't* want to be helped, I *don't* want to be kept from temptation, and *don't* want to be better than I am.

Or you say: If only I had more spiritual life; or if I had but more knowledge of God's ways and more understanding of His word. I wish I had more sense of His Presence in my heart, or less eagerness in seeking pleasure as the end of life. And yet when Christ asks: Do you really and truly want less pleasure and more grace?—your heart fails.

For see, friends, how simple His ways are. I allow and believe that nothing but the mighty spirit of God can enable us to do any of these good things of which I have spoken. Yet the miracles of grace now are like the miracles of mercy then. When the man said, Lord, I want sight; Christ answers in one word, "Look up"! the thing is done! So now; most of the things we pray for are in our hands already: they have but to be used. You say you want God's Presence in your heart, yet any trifle of society, or business, or pleasure, you let come between you and Him—*Let that cease:* "look up" and you see Him. You say you regret being the slave of your appetite—then surely nothing is simpler—*don't satisfy it.* That it does not require the Lord God to come and tell you; any man of strong will — nay, any man who is man at all—can tell you that.

No, friends: keep the one pure jewel of *truth,* keep that, at any rate, from being sullied. Don't tell God one thing on your knees, and a totally different thing on your feet. Pray for what you want, and not for what you don't want. But what

strange prayers we should sometimes pray! Yet it were well to pray them, perhaps.

All this notwithstanding, I would urge you, dear friends, to ask really and ask often from this Saviour of ours. I have tried to expose some of the unreality of our religion. But now do this: *come with that very unreality which you detest*, and bring just that very thing to Him. He stands only waiting to know what we are ready to receive. Finding yourself blind, pray first: Lord that I may receive my sight.

I believe that as true and as great lives are possible now as they were in days of old, and a true and great life is more noble now than then, just inasmuch as heroism is more difficult in the commonplace than in the supreme moments of life. I believe that at the root of all our shortcomings in this our Christian life, is the canker-worm of a lack of expectation. We expect to be saved at last, but not now. We want to be holy in a general kind of indefinite way, but not to part with this sin or that. We want to be somewhat Christ-like; but we don't want to be quite like Christ. We want to be perfect, but we don't like to alter any one imperfection.

Now, friends, is not this a pity? There is our Christ: there is the grace and the strength needed: there is the Good Shepherd knowing exactly where the foe lurks, and where the pleasant pastures are to be found. There is the Healer, the giver of life and light, and here are we with our darkened eyes and our poverty-stricken graces. Do let me urge you, brethren, in the name of my Lord, to seek with me true, real, definite help for true, real, definite faults and failings this Lent. "Ask and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full."

THE EVENING OF THE RESURRECTION.

By the Rev. JAMES A. CARR, LL.D.,
Vicar of Whitechurch.

A Sermon Preached in Whitechurch, on the First Sunday after Easter, April 28th, 1889.

"Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you."—St. John, xx. 19.

THE Gospel for to-day associates the ministry of the Christian Church directly with the risen Lord as its fountain-head. Jesus Christ had suffered and died. The third day He rose again from the dead. In the meantime, what had happened? The great expiation had been made, that great transaction to which all the Old Testament sacrifices pointed, had been fulfilled. The one full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, had been consummated on the cross. The blood that cleanseth from all sin had been shed, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world had been offered up, and the resurrection of our Lord from the death thus inflicted upon Him, was the proof and evidence of His complete justification, of the acceptance of His atoning sacrifice. It was the Father's recognition of Him, the acknowledgment of His work, of its sufficiency and perfection. He raised Him up from the dead and gave Him glory. He was then declared to be the Son of God, with power by the resurrection from the grave. Once more there was a fulfilment of the second Psalm, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." He was the first begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth.

It was this quickened Lord then, this Jesus who had suffered and died and risen again from the dead, thus honoured and thus authenticated, who now appeared in the midst of His disciples. And He appeared no longer as in the days of His humiliation and suffering. A great change had passed over the Body of the risen and glorified Saviour. It was now a Spiritual Body, and capable of dispensing spiritual gifts. If the first man Adam had been made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. As such our Lord on the evening of the resurrection appeared to His disciples in the upper room in Jerusalem. There they were gathered together, the doors being shut for fear of the Jews; and while they were thus gathered together for mutual comfort and encouragement, and most likely in the very place that a short time before had witnessed the institution of the Last Supper, Jesus Himself came and stood in the midst of them.

We want nothing more than this to show us that our Lord's risen Body had now been freed from the limitations that confine and regulate the movements of our material frames. It was the same Body that forty days later was to assert its independence over the ordinary law of gravitation, and ascend visibly through the upper air out of the sight of His adoring and wondering disciples. It was a Body so assimilated to spiritual existence, that wherever the spirit within willed it to be, there it was. And so observe that it is not said here merely that Jesus stood in the midst, but that He *came* and stood in the midst. He came passing immediately through space and through all intervening obstacles, and revealed Himself in the sight of His disciples.

And what is there to hinder our Lord thus coming again, and from time to time, to His tried and suffering servants? What is there to hinder His standing by them all unseen, and yet not unfelt, while He strengthens and encourages them and helps them to fight the good fight of faith? We certainly do know that it was St. Paul's belief that the Lord stood with him and strengthened him in a critical moment in his life, and delivered him out of the mouth of the lion; and if with St.

Paul, why not with others? May we not believe that oftentimes in the history of His Church, Christ has stood by His suffering servants to succour them and to deliver them?

The Gospel for to-day goes on to show us how the risen Lord is the source of all blessing and spiritual power to His Church. First, the disciples received from Him on this Easter evening the blessing of peace. He who had made peace by the Blood of His Cross, now gives peace. The salutation is their absolution. They all had deserted Him a short time before, and one had denied Him. Only one had stood by His cross. And yet His words on this His first meeting with them after His Resurrection were these, "Peace be unto you." And when He had so said, in order that that peace might be fully and altogether theirs, He showed them His hands and His side. He conveyed home to their minds in this way the reality of His Bodily presence in the midst of them, that it was He, and no other, who a short time before had suffered death by crucifixion. And to us also who believe on Him, comes peace through the same channel. To us, as we mark the wounds of the Lord Jesus, as we know and believe that He died for us, that He suffered for our sins according to the Scriptures, there comes this same peace, the peace of pardon, of reconciliation with God, through Him "who was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification."

And from the Risen Lord comes the germ of all ministry. He is Himself the Head of the Church, which is His Body mystical. He did not leave the ministry of His Church to be a matter of chance, regulation, or of after-human institution. He did not leave a spiritual chaos behind Him to be reduced and brought into order by others, but He left a divinely organised Body. The apostles were not to take powers to themselves, but were to receive their powers from Christ. "As my Father hath sent Me, even so send I you; and when He had said this, He breathed on them and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Note again how the Risen Christ is the source of all spiritual endowment to His Church. Peace, ministry, the gift of the Holy Ghost, the power of the keys, the retention of, and absolution from, sin—all flow from the Lord Jesus Christ. He breathed on them. The act was sacramental. His Divine Breath was the outward visible sign of the proceeding of the Spirit of ministry from Him to them.

Brethren, it is a madness to desire to break the continuity of this ministerial commission first given in that upper room in Jerusalem on the day of the Resurrection. Why should we desire to do so? why should we desire to cut ourselves off from our great and priceless heritage? Whatever opinion individuals may have of the force and extension of the solemn words then spoken by the great Ordainer, there can be no doubt as to the mind of the Church on this matter. It does not leave us to toss on the waves of doubt and difficulty in the frail bark of private judgment in the matter of the application of these solemn words, for it takes them out of this Gospel and puts them into the mouths of the Bishops of the Church when they ordain to the sacred office of the Christian priesthood. "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God now committed unto you by the imposition of our hands; whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained."

And who that rightly think over it would wish it otherwise, and wish to cut themselves off from this great inheritance, from a share in the spiritual blessing that was then committed by our Lord to the original ministers of His Church. It was a great deposit placed in their hands; the ministry of reconciliation, the preaching of God's Holy Word, and the administration of His sacraments, the declaration of the free forgiveness of sins, and of the grace and virtue of repentance, the danger of unbelief, and the certainty of God's judgment on every impenitent transgressor. Would you wish to cut yourselves off from a share in this ministry committed by Christ to His Church in the persons of His eleven disciples on the day of the Resurrection? Or will you not jealously claim your share in it, and believe that you too receive spiritual mercies and blessings through the same channel, that the river of grace has never ceased to flow; and that the Word and Sacraments which are yours to-day, are the very same with those committed by Christ to His Apostles to be the faithful dispensers of, and to hand down unimpaired and inviolate to all generations? "The things that thou hast heard of me," writes Paul to Timothy, "the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." An historical Church and an historical Christianity; these are ours, brethren, and we dare not separate ourselves from them, and therefore we say, "I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church," I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins, and inasmuch as Christ's Resurrection is the pledge of ours, "I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come."

The Church of Ireland is planted in this land to witness to these great truths, and to hand them on from age to age. Its rival is the Church of Rome, and, believe me, we cannot contend against its errors and superstitions by a creedless and colourless Christianity, or by the discordant sects of yesterday. We need in this land such a Church as ours, professing a faith grounded on Holy Scripture interpreted by the creeds of an undivided Christendom, and tracing its spiritual lineage and ministerial commission back in unbroken succession to that upper room in Jerusalem and the afflatus of the

Holy Ghost. And that this heritage may remain with us in the full endowment of Evangelical truth and Apostolic order, and Catholic faithfulness, we must maintain a learned, devout, and zealous clergy. "The labourer is worthy of his hire." The day that sees an inferior, an uneducated, an untrained clergy ministering in the Church of Ireland, will witness the decadence of that Church and its possible overthrow, when Rome will remain master of the field with her alien orders, her foreign rule, and her unscriptural and superstitious doctrines. It is for you of the laity to see that that day never comes, and at all costs to keep the light of Divine truth burning in this land and extending its radiance.

THE Rev. F. J. Braithwaite, rector of Great Waldingfield, Suffolk, died suddenly last week.

IT is very generally said that the late Dr. Wright expressed an earnest hope during his illness that he might be succeeded in the Chair of Arabic at Cambridge by Mr. Robertson Smith, who held the post of Lord Almoner's Reader before he was elected to the Librarianship. There is every reason to believe that some pressure will be brought to bear to induce the Librarian to accede to this wish and become a candidate, and he might perhaps not be unwilling to have more time at his disposal for study and teaching. If he is a candidate it is not likely that there will be any serious opposition to his election. Speculation thus points to the possibility of a vacancy in the office of Librarian.

THE annual meeting at Oxford of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta was held on Sunday last at Keble College. Dr. Paget took the chair, and gave an account of the present position of the Mission. He said that they had suffered a great loss in the fact that Mr. Townshend, who had in the past rendered service of a very high and rare kind, had now severed his connection with the Mission, and returned to England. There was, however, good news as well. By the efforts of Miss Murray and other friends, the sum of £2,500 had been raised to provide a larger and healthier house for the Mission in Calcutta. The late Bishop of Oxford, who had been unfailing in his sympathy and earnest care for the work, had been succeeded as Chairman by the present Bishop; and he thought that it was a real encouragement that they should have at their head one who not only in Oxford, but throughout and beyond England, was regarded with such reverence and trust as Dr. Stubbs. In the autumn Mr. Gore and Mr. Wakeman hoped to pay a visit of some months to the Mission, and with them went a new worker, Mr. Field, now a curate at St. John the Divine, Kennington. The Rev. E. F. Brown, one of the members of the Mission, then gave a most interesting description of the work that was being done in Calcutta, and in India generally, dwelling on the difficulties of dealing with Eastern thought, and on the necessary slowness with which results became apparent. He paid a high tribute to the work of the Church Missionary Society, and said that although its methods might seem to some not to be the best, it was difficult to assert that any others were more successful. Mr. Gore and the Warden of Keble also briefly addressed the meeting.

Certain HARNESS' Cure.
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
FOR
RHEUMATISM
Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh, writes:—"*The Electropathic Belt has* **completely cured** *me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense agony for two years. I now feel strong and active.*"
Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. **Pamphlet & Advice free on application** to **Mr. C. B. Harness,** *Consulting Electrician,* the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
On y Address,
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W. (*Corner of Rathbone Place.*)
Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 8, 1889.

CHARITY.

FEW subjects are of more pressing interest at the present time than that of the judicious or injudicious administration of "Charity" which we cursorily canvassed last week. "Charity," may be used as a means for causing or preventing poverty, but in very many cases the former is the result brought about. It is a curious fact, but one worthy of note, that in those parishes where most money is given away in so-called relief the poverty is greatest, in other words a careful comparison will show that, except in a few instances, penury is in direct proportion to the "charity." The Charity Commission, no doubt in view of these facts, have in many cases dealt most summarily with legacies and bequests, especially those of more modern date; and it would be wandering upon *terra ignota* indeed, to attempt even to conjecture how far their drastic measures may be carried. But as in other matters, there are two sides to this question. In many places, and especially in the country, the administration of oldstanding charities often leads to great unpleasantness, and indeed has frequently resulted in estrangements of the most disastrous nature. The trustees, too, of these charities being in many instances utterly ignorant if not careless of the real circumstances of those who become recipients are easily led into errors of the gravest nature. In fact, in some parishes there are two or three generations that have never known any other means of livelihood than that of the local charities. As in very many instances the clergyman, who is perhaps the only one who knows the real state of affairs, is excluded from the trust, the administration of those funds is often, to use the mildest term,

very injudicious. On the other hand it does seem hard that the Will of any person may be absolutely set aside, and that money left for a specific purpose may be ruthlessly alienated from the testator's original purpose, and all this within a year of his death. One course there is, however, which we should like to see adopted by the Commissioners. Why are not these superfluous charities converted into a means of endowing the fabric of churches: Many of the grandest old churches, which might be the pride, and certainly are an ornament to our country, are daily falling into decay, whilst a large number of practically superfluous scholastic buildings are being daily erected and endowed. Would that more were done by the means at the disposal of the commissioners to preserve those buildings in which the most important education is given—a religious one. Let us hope on.

OUR CHRISTIAN YEAR.

WHIT-SUNDAY.

WHIT-SUNDAY carries us back in thought to the days of long ago, when the small band of disciples, sorrowing at the departure of their Lord, disappointed in their brightest hopes, yet faithfully, and with what patience they could learn, waited for the fulfilment of Christ's promise, that He would send them a Comforter. Patient abiding trust in the Word of God is never misplaced; be the reward never so long in coming, it does come, the reward is always given. So these disciples found. Assembled in that "upper room" already endeared to them by so many precious associations, the Promised Light came. They were endowed with powers far beyond what their most sanguine thoughts had pictured. They were weak, erring, humanly speaking most unfit persons to found the great Christian Church. The light of the Holy Spirit shined upon their Darkness, and they became able missionaries. It is this great gift of spiritual perception, one of the greatest graces of the Holy Ghost, which we ask in this Whit-Sunday Collect. How often in the various concerns of life, do thoughtful people meet with the supreme difficulty of not being able to see which is the best and truest course to take! How often are we called upon suddenly to decide upon some important step! How often do our decisions, upon what seem comparatively trivial matters, influence greatly our future career. How important then is it, how all-essential, that the *trend* of our minds should be to the right. Do we not need, in these days, when men seem to endeavour so industriously to raise up evil and good, to be specially prayerful on this point? To strive, by God's help, to have such a spiritually true intuition, that we shall escape the snare that we continually meet with; the temptation to let some other consideration than the simple question, "Is it right?" influence us. Then comes the other point which our collect brings out, the bestowal of that further gift of "comfort." How men strive and worry; how they toil early and late, and employ various means all to this one end, and how they fail! There is but *one* road to this as to all other true joys—the way which God points out. A wealthy man can nearly always find more than plenty who are willing to accept his benefits in *his* way: glad only to have the opportunity of receiving what they want. Yet when our Loving God offers gifts so far beyond what man can bestow, we would often do anything rather than take them as He directs. So the only way to attain to true comfort is through the practice of that "right judgment in all things," which shall raise us above that moral twilight, which takes certainty from our course of action; spiritual backbone from our deeds, and consequently peace from our minds.

AUNT OR STEPMOTHER?

ONCE more the Wife's Sister has been led up to the bar of the House of Lords, and the petition of her half-orphaned nephews and nieces has been rejected by a small majority. We were again told that it was a poor man's question, and was not brought forward on behalf of a few rich men who had contracted these alliances. The *Unionist* argument, too, was urged, namely, that those in favour of the integrity of the Empire should seek to remove an obstruction and aspersion from their Colonial fellow subjects who visit the old country. Lord Grimthorpe said that on twenty-two occasions the House of Lords had divided on this Bill, besides passing it on a great many others without a division, while for forty years the majority had gone on increasing. Another noble Lord met the appeal for protection to the unmarried sister-in-law from an imaginary danger, by giving an instance of the existing restriction producing the very same effect as that so strongly deprecated, where a man whose sister-in-law had been at the head of his establishment said that after a time their situation became intolerable, simply on account of the views of the society by which they were surrounded. It is at best a very *thin* "hear, hear," which is invariably got up when this stage of the argument is reached, and the House is pathetically assured that if this Bill becomes law, "hundreds of families will be deprived of the loving care of their aunt." It is thin and hollow, because the applauders know that if this were to be the case a far greater benefit would be conferred on thousands of other families, poor and rich alike. It reminds one of the "feeble cheer" which arose when Mr. Squeers appeared in the schoolroom at Dotheboys Hall to announce his return from London. At the pleasing intelligence that his pupils' parents and guardians were so delighted to hear how happy they were that there was no prospect of their going home at present, "two or three hands went to two or three eyes"; and we take it the same act was figuratively performed by those unhappy Peers who once more failed to convince their right honourable brethren that society would not stigmatise the aunt's superintendence of the motherless household, and that in doing so no woman need run her head against public opinion. They know that in point of fact they have no plea that has not been worn threadbare, and so they weep for vexation when the aunt's sentimental grievance is scattered to the winds. Earl Percy, the most lengthy speaker among the opponents to the Bill, endeavoured to show that there was no tangible foundation for the proposed change, giving a list of sources from which he declared it was *not* derived, *e.g.*, Scripture (?); the practically unanimous voice of the Church for over 1,800 (*sic*) years, the ancient Roman Law, the more

recent Law of Christian Rome, and the Napoleonic Code. He did *not* think well to refer to the law of this country before the time of Henry VIII. He strove hard to convince the House that the Wife's Sister and the Brother's Widow were analogous cases, and that there was no logical ground for not including *all* the prohibited degrees in this Measure. He very truly said that "our marriage law is at the best one of the strongest invasions of the liberty of the subject it is possible to conceive." It certainly is neither perfect nor consistent. If it were, it would not need to be altered. "It is neither biblical nor logical, it is simply outwardly symmetrical," to use Mr. Paynter Allen's words; but the ideas of what is biblical and logical, as held by that gentleman and the noble earl respectively, are based upon very different premises. To us, the Table of Kindred and Affinity in our Prayer Book signifies nothing more than an impertinent intrusion thrust into that volume without legal authority in the year 1603 by certain divines who, like our friends of the Marriage Law Defence Union, believed that table to contain a comprehensive recital of those "forbidden in Scripture and our laws to marry together." As regards Holy Scripture, we do not, as our opponents appear to do, consider the Levitical Code as of universal and perpetual obligation. To place it, or parts of it, on a level with the Ten Commandments, would be especially inconsistent in respect of the Marriage Laws. The Decalogue contains a *summary* of all moral laws which bind all men in all ages, and which are still further summarised by our Lord in His two Great Commandments. The much contested xviii. Leviticus is confined to the elaboration of one universal law—"Thou shalt not commit adultery," as more particularly adapted to the age and conditions of the Jewish Dispensation. While in their essence the moral laws are unchangeable, the restrictions protecting the divine institution of marriage must be adapted to man's varying requirements and social state. In the beginning, when there was but one father and mother, Adam and Eve, their own children were matrimonially united in order to people the earth, brother with sister, and *vice versâ*. In each succeeding generation the consanguinity would become more remote, until nations sprang up who had lost count of their connection with the first parents. When men corrupted themselves upon the face of the earth, and polyandry arose, restrictions became imperative, and certain degrees were prohibited in the laws, both of God and man. These degrees may be altered from time to time as occasion may require, either by enlarging or diminishing their scope. Thus *we* are not bound by mistaken interpretations of Scripture, which would promote either unnatural celibacy, or appear to sanction lust and incest. Nor are we constrained to accept the dangerous pretence that because our Lord was ever virgin, therefore all His followers must be so likewise. The Archbishop of Canterbury and Earl Percy, whilst declaiming against the legalisation of marriage with a brother's widow, agreed that neither was it lawful among the Jews, nor was it desired now by the promoters of the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, who had always declined to accept that addition. In the notable instance of Judah's two sons and the widow Tamar, quoted by the Archbishop, the reason why her husband's brother was commanded to take her is plain; but one part of the transaction is often overlooked. She had borne no child to Er, and therefore was not "one flesh" with him in that sense wherein all mothers become related to the fathers of their children. Had she been so related, the brother would not have been allowed to "approach unto" her, lest the physical and mental constitution of her offspring should suffer in consequence. This is the real objection to marriage with a brother's widow. It is a physiological one, making the union one of consanguinity, whereas that with a wife's sister is purely one of affinity. A man may marry a second sister who, though a blood relation of his children, is no relation of his own; but he cannot marry his brother's widow who has borne children without endangering the health of her second family. As we pointed out in our article last September, on the Marriage Question, man is by nature polygamous, while woman is monogamous, and polyandry is as opposed to the law of nature as to the law of God. Those who dread the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill as the natural precursor of the other marriage which they wrongly conceive to be analogous to it, may, we think, with advantage set their minds at rest and banish their fears as groundless. If such a marriage should become law, it will not be through the agitation of those who wish to have the same privilege as their fellow subjects enjoy in the Colonies. From the *social* standpoint, which is really the momentous and urgent side of the question to the vast majority of those interested in the subject, the wife's sister, besides being known and loved by the orphans, is tied to them by blood, while the brother's widow may be a complete stranger, having no more claim to their affection than any other stepmother whom their father might choose for them.

CLANDESTINE MARRIAGES.

It was recently stated by the Bishop of London in Convocation that the existing law relative to marriage after banns was practically inoperative in many instances, more especially in towns, where the parties only make a pretence of residing for the prescribed fifteen days. To "hang up your hat" is one thing; to eat, drink, and sleep is quite another. His Lordship proposed to avert this evasion of the law by requiring the banns to be published where the man about to be married was an ordinary and permanent resident, thus securing publicity. At present it is quite possible for both parties to be "published" in one or in two parishes where they are both equally unknown, thus rendering their union as secret as if they went to a foreign land. It seems to us that, while on the one hand it facilitates clandestine marriages, the line now drawn has a tendency to tighten with needless pressure in another direction. When the banns have been duly published in the place of residence of the parties, why should they be prevented from being married in any church they please, not merely in the same diocese, but in any part of the country? All that would be required for this purpose would be a certificate of the publication of banns, and an entry in the register, "Of the parish of ——." People often live in a place where they are comparative strangers, having only been brought to it by their business, or the force of circumstances over which they have no control. It is but natural that the minds of rightly-disposed persons should at such a time revert to the associations which are dearest to them, both of locality, kindred, and acquaintance. A has left her friends to go to service. B, her lover, has also left their native parish to earn his bread. The banns are published in both parishes

where at the time they reside. They both desire to be married "at home," often by the clergyman who has baptised them both, prepared them for Confirmation, and administered to them their first Communion; but they are forbidden by law to do so. Unless the bride can obtain her release some weeks beforehand, the banns cannot be published at home. Or suppose she is working in a factory or shop, and cannot afford to give up her employment, which she has to resume again after marriage, these things make the home wedding an impossibility as the law now stands Or in well-to-do circles there often are obstacles which prevent the legal period of residence, and so resort is obliged to be had to the Marriage Licence. In these days, when people go hundreds of miles from home to earn their bread, the fifteen days' residence is no less a source of hardship to those desirous of being married where they were born and are best known, than it is a temptation to evade the law where clandestine marriage is sought. But there is a further aid to this latter evil, furnished, as the Bishop of London points out, by the modern civil marriage at the Registry Office. This provides a modified form of Gretna Green in every Union. Take, for instance, two factory hands, both comparative strangers to the neighbourhood they work in, or living some eight or ten miles from the Registry Office. How many people go and read the names, much less make inquiries about the parties intending to enter upon the civil contract there offered? Or, if they did, who would know John Smith and Mary Jones? This evil cannot altogether be remedied, it is true, but the Bishop is quite right when he says that the great increase of these marriages is due to a large extent to the fact that marriages in church are more costly than before a Registrar. Persons who wish to be married in church ought not to be made to pay more than they would be called on to pay if married before a Registrar, and temptation ought not to be put in their way to marry without getting the blessing of the Church on their union. He, therefore, proposes to fix the Church fee for marriage by Act of Parliament, such fee not to be dearer than that for marriage before a Registrar, which is so fixed at 5s. The usual church fee, including publication of banns, is 8s. 6d. If all the clergy would make this sacrifice—which in many cases *would* be a sacrifice—they would have less quarterly "*nil* returns," and draw those around them who in many cases would be lost otherwise. The spiritual gain to the parties themselves, as well as the satisfaction of retaining worshippers in the congregation, would amply repay the loss of a few shillings. We earnestly commend this to our clerical readers for their favourable consideration. One other question arises in connection with this subject. What are we to do with those who have unfortunately made these non-religious marriages? A clergyman of our acquaintance recently asked his diocesan this question, and whether, if he could get them to come to church, he might read the service over them. The Bishop replied in the affirmative. It is impossible to read the Marriage Service over a man and his wife's sister, which would involve the officiating minister in a breach of the law; but there is no reason to prevent the service being used for those who, having been civilly united, do afterwards see their error, and desire God's blessing upon their union as well as man's recognition of it. May the obstacles to public and religious marriages be speedily removed, and in the meantime let us do our best to make straight the path of those who from ignorance or bad example omit that which lies at the root of all marriage worthy the name, that is, the prayer for God's help and sustaining grace to enable them to keep the vows and fulfil the obligations of a wedded life.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE MINISTRY OF EVIL.

SIR,—Mr. Dixon has shifted his position. I am not surprised at it. It was untenable. He says I employ the word purpose where I should use the word *attitude*, and as any straw is clutched at by a drowning man, so he clutches at a hypothetical case, and asks me to answer his deduction, for on this, he implies, hinges his whole theory. Now, Mr. Dixon, I am not going to allow you to draw a red herring across the trail of my argument. You took up the position that God does not permit the machinations of men or devils to clash with His divine purposes, and I shall bind you to this; you need not attempt to get away from it by a side issue. I used the word purpose because you used it, and I gave instances where this purpose had been opposed and interfered with, and you have not attempted to gainsay them But as to the relative bearings of the words *purpose* and *attitude*, which you think I have confounded, permit me to enlighten you upon them. The purpose is the state of mind which precedes creation, whether it be a world, a man, or a statute. The attitude is the state of mind which watches the fulfilment of the purpose. Thus God purposes that man shall not steal, and creates a commandment "Thou shalt not steal." His attitude, which, as you see is subsequent to His purpose, is to mark whether His command is obeyed or violated. Hence you will acknowledge, I trust, that I am right and you are wrong, for your common sense will tell you that it would be absurd to talk about clashing with God's *attitude*. It was clashing with His *purpose* that you spoke about. It was clashing with His *purpose* that I exposed, and the word attitude never came into my correspondence at all.

Will not this explanation satisfy you and lead you to abandon a position which even Arminius himself, with the light of the nineteenth century, would hardly dare to maintain. JOHN A. WALKER.

Dublin.

SIR,—I am desirous of submitting some observations on Mr. Sandland's letter in this day's PULPIT.

I do not use the word opponent in an offensive sense. I simply mean that my views are entirely opposed to his. In a communication written by me, which appeared in the PULPIT of 15th October, 1887, headed "A Contrast," I endeavoured to exhibit the difference in a clear manner.

He belongs to the party who hold that the object and design of the Scheme of Redemption, through Christ, is to gather together a Church which shall glorify God, and shall be holy and happy for ever; but that those who are not united to Christ in this life will be abandoned by God to endless, hopeless depravity and misery.

It is my undoubting belief that God is the Father of all His intelligent creatures, and that it is His firm purpose to train all for a safe, holy, and happy

immortality. The Scheme of Redemption, through Christ, with the complete satisfaction made to God's justice, the tender appeal to the affection of intelligent creatures, and the wondrous plenitude and potency of spiritual influences, has ample and effective resources to accomplish that grand and beneficent purpose. The principle of election contemplates the attainment of universal objects. The members of the Church, which is being gathered in this life, will be engaged, not only while on earth, but throughout countless ages, in earnest and most congenial efforts to win the universe to Christ. Of them it is said (James i. 18), "Of His own will begat He us, with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of His creatures"; also (2 Cor. vi. 1), "Workers together with Him."

In regard to punishment, whether in this life or the next, I am glad to find that two bishops have expressed opinions very congenial to me. The Bishop of Argyll, in "Revelation Considered as Light," chap. v.: "God is being recognised as One whose tender mercies are over all His works . . . . educating as often by punishment as by pardon, judging that He may teach, not teaching that He may judge." Speaking of the Gospel Scheme in chap. ii.: "It opened heaven and shut hell, by giving Him a heaven, which, if at times far off, was ever sure in the bosom of the Father, and which shut up hell by exhausting it of its darkness, giving it a meaning and power by showing that it is not endless, but the way to righteousness."

Then the Bishop of Manchester, in the sermon which appeared in the PULPIT of 15th December last, said that the master-truth of Christ's message to the world is the universal Fatherhood of God. "Do we read of a future misery, set forth in dark and terrible symbols . . . . we know that that misery is only such as the most loving Father might inflict at the demand of justice, and for the benefit of the sufferer. . . . Election . . . . having for its object, not the weal or woe of individuals, but the blessing and redemption of the whole human race." The Bishop intimates that this regulative master-truth harmonises all texts.

Any personal questions between Mr. Sandlands and myself I leave to the judgment of those who have read my statements and his representations of them.

Mr. Sandlands indicates that my reference to those "who calmly, serenely, and even almost joyfully anticipate endless misery," is a reprehensible caricature. Dr. Farrar, in "Mercy and Judgment," chap. iv., said that even at the present period writers in the *Church Quarterly* repeated what he called the conventional nonsense that "if there were no endless hell, there would be no God and no love." He also gave, among similar sentiments by good men, the declaration of Jonathan Edwards, that "the view of the misery of the damned will double the ardour of the love and gratitude of the saints in heaven." In our days hell and its torments are seldom plainly brought forward by preachers. But the holders of the gloomy views are apparently unwilling to give up the expectation of an endless hell, as they manifest anger against those who deny the doctrine, and will hardly listen to any arguments from them.

I do not admit that there is any logical correctness in the last paragraph of Mr. Sandland's letter. I endeavoured to show in my remarks, which appeared in the PULPIT of 4th ult., in what way the existence of evil operates for the welfare of the intelligent creation.

J. B.

Canonbury, 1st June, 1889.

"ROBERT ELSMERE."

SIR,—In the leader of a recent PULPIT you say, "We question whether it ['Robert Elsmere'] can be of any real service, except to show how a man by historical research may ultimately lose grasp of the faith" This statement seems to me delightfully ambiguous, and may be very misleading. "Robert Elsmere" shows, if it really shows anything, how a man by a partial and one-sided historical research, based on false logic, may ultimately lose grasp of the faith.

"Robert Elsmere's" research is confined to the sixth and seventh centuries. He repudiates the miracles of that period. *Therefore* the miracles of the first century are myths, therefore Christ did not rise again, therefore miracles do not happen.

The logic of this argument is equivalent to the following: A man told me a falsehood seven days ago. Therefore, what some one else told me seventeen days ago cannot be true. Surely it does not follow. Yet this is Mrs. Ward's argument in a nutshell.

The squire is made to say:

"In the first place, I shall find present in the age which saw the birth of Christianity, as in so many other ages, a universal preconception in favour of miracle. . . . The air teems with them. [This, by the way, is a gross exaggeration; to wit, the incredulity of the Pharisees, and especially the Sadducees. But let that pass.] . . . . Very well, allow for it."

It has been allowed for to the fullest extent, and there has in consequence been prosecuted a historical and critical research as to the value and trustworthiness of the testimony of the New Testament—both hostile and friendly—such as no other literature in the whole world has been subjected to. What has been the result? Permit me to quote Dr. Lyman Abbott, whose testimony is typical of the testimony of the majority of the liberal-minded and enlightened men of this age. He says, "I cannot here give the reasons which lead me to believe in the historic trustworthiness of the Four Gospels, and especially to regard the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead as *the best attested fact* of ancient history."

"Robert Elsmere" sits down and smokes his pipe, and apparently suddenly arrives at this stupendous conclusion: "*Miracles do not happen.*" How has he arrived at this all-important decision? We are left to divine. Arguments there are none.

What a grand tribute Mrs. Ward pays Christianity—all the grander because quite unintentionally and apparently quite unconsciously on her part. By far and away the best character in the book is the consistent and devoted Christian, Catherine; the worst unquestionably is the champion and expounder of Mrs. Ward's own creed, the squire.

London.

CURATE.

THE RECENT GENERAL SYNOD IN DUBLIN.

SIR,—As it has been stated, in an Irish newspaper, that in the recent important debate in the Dublin Synod, "The bugbear of Ritualism was simply laughed at," may I say a few words on the subject?

I was present during the whole of the debate, and I must confess that I think the matter was viewed with all seriousness. There were excellent speeches of sound Protestant tone made by the Lord Bishop of

Cashel and the Lord Bishop of Meath, and neither of these venerable prelates displayed the slightest tendency toward hilarity. The question really is this, Are the Canons of the Church of Ireland to be obeyed loyally or "simply laughed at"? It is a fact known to many that in three Dublin churches large crosses are now prominently displayed over the communion tables or "altars." This is plainly forbidden by Canon xxxvi. At funeral services in one of these churches masses for the dead are recited, and candles arranged around the coffin in the chancel, burning night and day; this is forbidden by Canon xxxv. Prayers are recited by the clergyman with his back to the congregation; this is forbidden by Canon v. In another church the cups are washed after the communion in the chancel by officiating minister; this is a ceremony forbidden by Canon xxxvii. In more than one of these churches people are observed "blessing themselves," just like genuine Roman Catholics; this is forbidden by Canon v. The confessional too has been set up, although the preface to our Revised Prayer Book declares that "no power," is to be ascribed to any minister of the church "in respect of forgiveness of sins after baptism." "Nor is it anywhere in our formularies taught or implied, that confession to and absolution by a priest are any conditions of God's pardon." I need not multiply cases or say more as to these disloyal practices. How clergymen can solemnly sign a declaration of assent to certain formularies and then "simply laugh at" these directions and Canons is, indeed, not a subject for merriment, but rather something to be ashamed of. We are surrounded in Ireland by various Protestant bodies, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, and Plymouth Brethren. If these innovations go on and increase, as they have done in the English Church, our people will be driven from the old church to join some other Christian community where idolatrous rites and ceremonies are unknown and superstitious doctrines are not inculcated.

AN IRISH CHURCHMAN.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE PROSE WORKS OF THE RIGHT REV. THOMAS KEN, OF BATH AND WELLS." London: Griffith & Co. Price 9d.

THIS is the cheapest book for the money to be easily found. It contains sermons, treatises on the Church Catechism, etc. It also gives in full his three hymns for morning, evening, and midnight. On these hymns we will make a remark. They contain severally 13, 11, and 12 verses; and in the whole 36 verses there are only two references to the second person of the Trinity: "Forgive me, Lord, for Thy dear Son," and "Blessed Jesus! Thou, on heaven intent." This led us to compare these hymns with the general run of those in common use, in which, it is not too much to say, that our Lord's manhood throws the Triune Deity entirely into the shade, nay, has, as it were, dethroned Him. This is a thought well worth consideration. Except in the Litany, our Church prayers are addressed to God, in the name of our Lord. Of a certain body, the Moravians, it has been observed, that they never address anyone but our Lord. What share Rome had in thus making one person of the Trinity exclude the others we will not say. Eventually, she has made all terminate in our Lord's humanity; and all grace centre in that humanity being grossly joined to our bodies in the Eucharist. The whole subject deserves thought. Ken's reverent language well contrasts with the familiarity of some of our hymns.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Anderson, Rev. James, Curate-in-Charge; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Whitehaven.
Bladon, Rev. W. B., Curate of St. Gabriel's, Pimlico; Vicar of Dullingham, Newmarket.
Blakiston, Rev. Robert, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Brickwell, Rev. Charles Porter, M.A., Rector of Buckland, Gloucestershire.
Brittan, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Darley Abbey; Rural Dean of Duffield.
Brown, Rev. Charles H., Rector of Carlby, Stamford.
Burgoyne, Rev. Arthur Francis, M.A., Vicar of Finchingfield, Essex.
Cowie, Very Rev. Benjamin Morgan, D.D., Dean of Exeter; Precentor of Exeter Cathedral.
Cummings, Rev. Hayman, Chaplain of Berks County Asylum; Chaplain of Oxford County Asylum, Littlemore.
Evans, Rev. David, Vicar of Abergele; Rural Dean of Rhos.
Fagan, Rev. G. H. F., Vicar of Exwick, near Exeter; Vicar of Kingskerswell, Devonshire.
Green, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Curate of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London; Vicar of Longdon, Worcestershire.
Haworth, Rev. J., M.A., Vice-Principal; Principal of the Training College for Schoolmistresses, Durham.
Hendy, Rev. Francis Paul James, B.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Jones, Rev. Joseph, Chaplain of H.M. Prisons, Plymouth.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, Rev. Reginald Bridges, formerly Rector of Mersham, Kent; Rector of West Grinstead, Sussex.
Lefroy, Ven. William, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Andrew's, Liverpool, and Archdeacon of Warrington; Dean of Norwich.
Mills, Rev. J. W., Rector of St. Lawrence, near Maldon; Vicar of St. George's, Birmingham.
Parker, Rev. C. Lewes E., M.A., Second Master of Rev. J. Nunns' School, Maidenhead; Head Master of St. James's College, South Leigh.
Phillips, Rev. W. H., Chaplain of Northampton Prison.
Phillpotts, Rev. Henry John, M.A., Rector of Walkerne, Herts.
Pritchitt, Rev. J. F. Stephen, Curate of Mare, Bath; Assistant Priest of St. Matthias's, Malvern Link.
Pruen, Rev. H. B., Curate-in-Charge of Twyning; Vicar of Moreton, Valence, near Gloucester.
Ryan, Rev. William Ewer, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Pilton, Devonshire.
Sandford, Ven. Ernest Grey, M.A., Chancellor of Exeter Cathedral.
Thorp, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of St. John-the-Divine, Felbridge, East Grinstead.
Upcher, Rev. H. Berners, Rector of Ashwell, Rutland.
Wilkinson, Rev. A. A., Curate of Diss, Norfolk; Rector of Icklingham, Suffolk.
Williams, Rev. W. Herbert, Rector of Bodelwyddan; Rural Dean of St. Asaph.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Akenhead, Rev. David, Vicar of Sand Hutton, at Gate Helmsley, York, on the 31st ult., aged 69.
Atkinson, Rev. Henry William, LL.B., formerly Vicar of Old Hill, at West Compton Abbas Rectory, Maiden Newton, near Dorchester, on the 25th ult., aged 49.
Bere, Rev. Charles Sandford, Vicar, at Morebath Vicarage, on the 29th ult., aged 60.
Braithwaite, Rev. Francis Joseph, M.A, for seventeen years Rector of the parish, Rural Dean, and late Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, at Great Waldingfield Rectory, Sudbury, Suffolk, on the 28th ult., in his 52nd year.
Waters, Rev. E. T., M.A., for twenty-two years Rector of Highclere, Hants, and for twenty years formerly Rector of Wyvenhoe, Essex, at Birmingham, on the 2nd inst., aged 67

The Church of England Pulpit.

RESURRECTION.

By the Bishop of MEATH.

Sermon Preached in St. Bartholomew's Church, Dublin, on Sunday, May 12th, 1889.

"The Lord is risen indeed."—St. Luke xxiv. 34.

IN certain Eastern countries there exists a custom which I cannot but think is very beautiful, and might well be imitated. On the morning of Easter Sunday, everyone, as he meets a friend or acquaintance, salutes him with the words, "The Lord is risen," and the person thus accosted returns the cheerful watchword, "He is risen indeed!" I think it would be well for us if we realised our Saviour's Resurrection with something of the same vividness; if to us it thus entered into the domain of secular life, instead of being a matter of mere ecclesiastical celebration. For on it, if we are to believe St. Paul, depend all our hopes for any other state than that in which we now move; and if this present life cannot content us within its present limits, it is to the Resurrection of Christ that we must look for something beyond it, and better.

Let us, then, consider our Lord's Resurrection *in itself* and *in its results*.

And, considering it *in itself*, we have to look at the *fact*, and at the *proofs* of the fact.

The *fact* is, that our Saviour rose from the dead with a body which not only did not die again, but which was also not liable to death. This is what St. Paul means when he says (in the words of our Easter anthem): "Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more: *death hath no more dominion over Him*."

This fact must be clearly grasped, if we want to understand the importance of this and every Sunday's celebration. Christ's Resurrection was not merely the revival and renewal of this present life. It is the beginning of an altogether new life; the first term of a new series, of a new order, of existence.

And hence the difference between the proof of it and the proof of any other resurrection, for instance, that of Lazarus. Lazarus and all the other persons whom Christ or His apostles raised from the dead during their ministry on earth, were seen at the moment of their resurrection and afterwards, indiscriminately, by all who might happen to be in their way. They were on the same footing of existence as everybody else: and were, therefore, shown indifferently to all alike. But our Saviour's case was completely different. He was raised, not to the life we now enjoy, or endure, whichever term be the fittest: He was raised to the life we hope to enjoy in the coming world; and therefore could be shown only to those in whom that future life was already present in its germ. "He was shown," says St. Peter, "not to all the people, but to witnesses, chosen before of God; even to us, "His apostles and disciples," who did eat and drink with Him after His Resurrection."

This reserve of evidence ought not to create suspicion. It is only one instance out of thousands of the operation of a general law. Throughout creation things, unless they are in some way related, have no action on each other. No sense but that of sight is cognisant of light. The vibrations of that strange substance for which there is no really discriminative name, and which resembles nothing else in Nature, are undetectable, so far as light is produced by them, save to the eye. Again, the magnet acts perceptibly only on iron and two other metals; silver and gold, tin, copper, platinum are dead to its powers. The same analogy pervades the higher world—the world of mind and spirit. The clown sees no beauty in Milton or Shakespeare; the infidel perceives no fittingness in Christianity; the rebels who had put their King to death by alien hands because He was too spiritual for them were not fit—probably they were not capable—of seeing Him in His spiritual and immortal body. Even His own loving, sorrowing, heart-broken disciples were sometimes blind, for a time, to His personality; their eyes were holden, we are told, on one occasion; and at all times, apparently, they were under a mysterious awe which quenched familiarity when they beheld Him. But this does not in the least impeach the reality of His repeated appearances to them; there was nothing else which they could have mistaken for Him; they were completely convinced, and not only *convinced*, but what is much more, they were *converted;* their whole character was changed by the mighty influence of those appearances; whilst the withholding of all such appearances from the gross and carnal and wicked multitude who had just insisted on His crucifixion, is exactly of the same nature as the absence of ocular evidence to the blind, of auricular evidence to the deaf. The proof of His Resurrection, of His living again—only with a far higher kind of life than formerly—the proof of this fact afforded to His apostles and disciples must have been overwhelming, when we reflect on the changes it wrought in them, and the wonders it enabled them to do. From trembling cowards, from stunned, broken-hearted mourners, it transformed them in a moment into heroes of the faith, into triumphant heralds of the most joyful tidings the world has ever heard. "Their sorrow was turned into joy, and their joy was full." No event in history is more absolutely certain than this, that they firmly believed that they

had seen and conversed with their Lord, alive after death; and that not once, but repeatedly; and this unquestionable conviction implies that His Resurrection was an actual fact; since nothing short of its being real and actual, could produce such a conviction in the teeth of all their previous prepossessions, and in spite of their complete discouragement.

I do not dwell on the spiritual aids granted them in consequence of His Resurrection, though they make the matter still more decisive. For, if they were really assisted by a power from on high, and nothing short of this could have enabled them to accomplish what they did, this certainly carries with it the truth of what that power enabled them to proclaim with such astonishing results; since it is impossible to imagine that God would directly aid them to disseminate a falsehood.

We have, thus, every reason to believe the reality of our Saviour's Resurrection that we have to believe any other established fact in history. For such facts we can only know now on the testimony of those who witnessed them, or on that of monuments or memorials of them, or institutions founded in consequence of them; and such testimony we have in the uncontradicted consentient, unanimous witness of all the apostles; and of hundreds besides them, who, though believers, were not apostles: whilst in every recurring Lord's Day (and not in the Festival of Easter only), we have a monument and memorial of the fact which is absolutely universal; conterminous now with the globe itself. For the Lord's Day, the first day of the week was adopted from the apostles' time, and has been kept ever since in memory of the Resurrection of the Redeemer. It is the weekly feast of the Resurrection; the weekly proclamation of that one stupendous fact.

Let me now call your attention to another aspect of our Saviour's Resurrection.

St. Paul's reasoning seems distinctly to imply that the body in which Christ appeared to His disciples after His Resurrection was what he calls the *spiritual* body. For he tells us that we are to be planted together with Him in the likeness of His Resurrection; and he also tells us that we are to be raised with spiritual bodies. If our bodies, then, on our resurrection, are to be in the likeness of His, the body in which He rose must have been a spiritual body. Now, if this were so, it not only goes far to explain why He was not displayed openly to all the people after He rose from the dead, but it does away with the strangeness which, on any other supposition, attaches to His appearances

The spiritual body which St. Paul teaches us to expect would seem to be a body in which the spirit, which is the highest portion of our triple nature (body, soul, and spirit), shall be the animating, vitalising principle, instead of that inferior principle which in Scripture is sometimes called the soul, the ψυχή, in contradistinction from the spirit or πνεῦμα. God "breathed into the nostrils" of the first man "the breath of life, and man became a living *soul*." But St. Paul expressly tells us that the second Adam, the Lord Jesus Christ, was made, or became, not a living soul, but a life-giving spirit (1 Cor. xv. 45). The difference between the first and the second Adam, according to the Apostle, is that spirit took the place in Christ which the animal soul did in Adam; in other words, that the body with which Christ rose has for its vitalising, animating principle, not the breath of that life which now animates our frail bodies, and cannot secure their existence against numberless accidents and diseases, and at length against the inevitable decay of age, but that spiritual part of us which is now only a dweller in a tenement not altogether fitted for it, and from which it must ultimately be evicted. This declaration of the Apostle opens out to us a completely new view of the Resurrection-body of our Saviour, and therefore at once accounts for all the strangeness which attaches to His appearances to His disciples after His death, because it represents them as what might well be expected in a body of so entirely different a constitution. The spirit is that part of our complex nature which is in necessary connection with necessary truth, and by which such truth is discovered and comprehended. Thus a person who is capable of understanding the elementary truths of arithmetic and mathematics at once discerns such elementary truths to be not accidental, and which might, therefore, be different from what they actually are, but truths which are essential, and which could not be different from what they are. For instance, it is simply impossible to suppose that two straight lines could enclose or shut in a space. It is simply impossible to suppose that two things which are each equal to some third thing should not be equal to each other. Truths like these are called *necessary* truths, because our minds or spirits are so constituted as to be in exact harmony with nature as regards them. Now, a body in which this spiritual part of our constitution is no longer a mere denizen or tenant, but of which it is actually the vitalising power, would seem necessarily to enjoy the same prerogatives, the same advantages, which its informing spirit enjoys. We are in our present state perpetually embarrassed by the inadequacy of the body to the mind or spirit, whereby mental exertion becomes mental effort, and soon exhausts the frame. We may expect that hereafter, with bodies absolutely congenial to our minds, the exertion of the mind will involve no effort, will bring with it no fatigue. Again, in our Lord's appearances after His Resurrection, we have, I think, something more than a hint that we shall possess habitually bodily powers resembling the power of the mind, *e.g.*, in sudden and instantaneous transference from place to place, even as the mind can instantaneously transfer

itself from one subject to another; in exemption from limitations of space and matter, even as the wind, in its operations, is exempt from limitations of space and matter. Thus we hear of our risen Lord being in the midst of His disciples in one moment, in spite of doors locked for fear of the Jews; and we hear of His disappearing with equal suddenness on another occasion, in the very act of breaking bread and blessing it. We read of His being seen in Galilee, on the brink of the Lake of Tiberias, with equal suddenness and unpreparedness. He goes before His disciples into Galilee, not with them. He has no known abode on earth. Where He was during the intervals between his appearances we are not informed. And St. Luke, in the first chapter of the Acts, uses a word regarding these appearances which is otherwise appropriated to what we call visions. It was a material body which appeared to them—a body which could be touched, which ate and drank before them, although we are carefully told that His doing this was to remove their doubts as to the reality of the body which they saw,—not to satisfy the demands of appetite, or the wants of Nature. It was a natural body which talked with them; but this body was subject to none of the limitations to which our present bodies are enslaved. All these curious symptoms, which are rather inferred from the Gospels than directly stated by them, to which they never call attention, and which, therefore, ordinary readers generally overlook,—all these strange phenomena, I say, entirely agree with the notions we might of ourselves be disposed to form of the nature and acts of a frame in which the highest principle that now exists in us should take the place now occupied by a lower, a purely animal principle. The spiritual body of our Lord is the key to the otherwise perplexing features of His appearances, those appearances being themselves foretastes, anticipations, in His Person, of the nature and powers of that spiritual body with which St. Paul declares that we shall hereafter be invested.

But there is a further consideration to be taken into account.

I have said that the spirit in man is that part of our complex nature which takes cognisance of necessary and essential truths, and to which such truths are necessary and essential. But it is to be remarked that the human spirit, as now constituted, does not feel the same immediate and instinctive certainty with regard to *all* necessary and essential truths. Thus the idea of a God who has created all things, and in whom all things consist, must surely be a necessary truth; but it does not appear so to all. With most men, indeed, I am inclined to think it is instinctive; but with many it is a subject of argument, with some few a matter even of denial. There are some who require to be reasoned into the belief that God exists; there are some who defy reasoning on the subject. And the existence and nature of God brings with it other truths which we generally call moral truths, for there is no sure foundation for *morality* as distinct from *custom* save the Being and the will of God. There cannot be a law without a legislator; and if there be no God there is no legislator, none who has a right to impose his decrees upon us, for the mere will of the majority can never bind the conscience of the individual. Social morality is thus annihilated by Atheism or Agnosticism. Nay, more, if there be no God it is preposterous to talk of morality at all, for in that case all is mere mechanism, and it is impossible (in spite of Mr. Herbert Spencer) to grind morality out of mechanism. Now the Being and Attributes of God ought to be as certain to the mind of man as any truths of mathematics are. So ought, therefore, the truths of morality to be. Were we perfect spirits, we ought to have the same kind of intuitive, isntinctive perception of religious and moral truth, that we now have of mathematical truths. How it has come to pass that we have not such an intuitive perception of what must be equally necessary truth no one has as yet explained. The only clue to this singular defect is the story of the Temptation and Fall of Man. Now this intuitive perception which we lack in religion and morality our Saviour seems to have possessed; and hence, probably, it came that He was never, for a single instant, perplexed as to what He should do or say on any occasion. The highest spiritual truths, pertaining to God and our relations to Him—in other words, our duty—were as clear to Him as the lower ones pertaining to number and space are to men in general. He could not be for a moment at a loss as to their application any more than we can be with regard to the bearing of such truths as that two and two make four, or that two straight lines cannot enclose a space.

Now, our connection with the fact which we this day and every Lord's day celebrate resides in this, that as our future life depends on our Saviour's life, so we expect to be made like Him in that future life in all points short of His actual Deity. If we have been united with Him in the likeness of His death, we shall also be united with Him in the likeness of His Resurrection. We shall, therefore, in that future life, not merely have bodies made like unto His body—spiritual bodies, perfectly adequate to all the requirements of their informing, vitalising spirits—we shall also have the same kind of intuitive perception as He had of the existence and nature of the Deity, and of our relations to Him. And this, I suppose, is the meaning of the Beatitude, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." They shall see God, not with the eye of the body, with which no man hath seen or can see Him, but with the eye, the spiritual eye of our future spiritual existence, which, our spirit being then in perfect unison with

His, shall perceive all that is discoverable to created intelligences of the One Supreme and Uncreated. The consequences, if they were the consequences, of the Fall, the mind not perfectly in harmony with God, the defects of intuition as regards spiritual and moral truth, shall be removed; and though "it doth not yet appear plainly what we shall be, we know that we shall become like unto Him, for we shall see Him as He is." God and His attributes shall become as immediate a subject of intuition to us as the axioms of arithmetic or geometry are now; and the relations of our mind and nature to His, and of our minds and natures to each other, which we call respectively by the names of religion and morality, shall become equally intuitional, equally certain, and equally inevitable as applied to conduct.

Such are some of the results—the necessary results—of Christ's Resurrection: life, full, essential, eternal life to all who give themselves to Him, and in that life eternal and essential happiness, because it will be not merely the copy, but the outcome of His life, and therefore in absolute conformity with the will of God.

It seems strange, when one reflects, considering the immense importance of our Saviour's Resurrection, that it is in reality so little thought about. Though we nominally dedicate each seventh day to its commemoration, the Resurrection of our Lord certainly does not come into our minds with anything like the frequency of His death, to the memory of which only one day in the year is set apart. Various reasons may be given for this. One assuredly is this, that Christians have come to confound the Lord's Day with the Sabbath; the day commemorative of the Saviour's rising to renewed and endless activity with the day commemorative of God's resting after the Creation; and the one commemoration has too generally eclipsed the other. I think much positive mischief has been done this way. Another reason is, that we do not generally realise what Christ's Resurrection actually means, and with what anticipations it is connected. Most Christians now, even those most devout, are hankering after some renewal on redintegration of the life that now is, with all its interests and pleasures, but without its pains. Such views have been even formulated and popularised in some little books bestowed on the English public by the lively genius of American authors. We are to have all our present comforts and appliances only in a higher and more enjoyable way. Such views rest really on conceptions of our future existence which are mean and false. This present world and all its belongings—all things visible, in a word—shall pass away. They belong to an order of things which is essentially evanescent, and which has mutation and decay and death stamped upon it. In the visible universe there is no abiding-place, no eternal rest for the Sons of God. Modern science has abundantly corroborated and confirmed a saying which, to most philosophers in ancient times, and to all physicists up to fifty years ago in modern times, was unwelcome and absurd; the doctrine of an apostle that the things seen are temporal—last only for a time. Now this is universally accepted. Perhaps the things unseen they will in time acknowledge to be eternal. It was over these temporal things, over this merely temporary state, that Christ's victory was achieved when He rose from the dead; and it is to our not conceiving of His Resurrection in this true light that much of our forgetfulness of it is due. We have grievously fallen away from the vividness with which the early Christians realised the meaning of His Resurrection, as we have wholly abandoned the emblems by which they continually expressed it, and fed their minds with recollections of it. Go into the catacombs at Rome, or examine the pictures which have been made of the relics there found of the very earliest Church, and you will look in vain for the cross or the crucifix; the symbols of that death of agony are absent from early Christian art. Instead of the Saviour extended on the Cross, you see Him enthroned in mild and cheerful majesty in the midst of His apostles teaching them; or, as the Good Shepherd, bearing home the lambs upon His shoulder, and going forth before His flock. These early believers, flying for their lives, hunted into caves and dens of the earth, yet fed their minds not on the contemplation of the sufferings of their Redeemer, but on the anticipation of His glory in heaven, or the recollection of His beneficence on earth. His death was to them, as their death was to themselves, merely the short, sharp, passage to an eternity of blessedness, not conceived and expressed in half-sensual imagery, not consisting in a happier worldliness, but exceeding all that eye had seen, or ear heard, or heart could imagine. Would to God we could rise to their level! discarding with them all those mournful emblems and paraphernalia which now make death terrible, or sometimes ludicrous; those urns, with weeping angels bending over them; those lugubrious accompaniments of death and funeral, which in reality contradict all Christian hope, and make a parade of defeated instead of triumphant life. And we should do this, dear friends, if we could but rise to the height of the great argument of Christianity, Hope and Faith, overcoming the seen and the temporal, and claiming the assured possession of the unseen and eternal.

Away, then, with gloom and downheartedness; away with *unbelief*, in other words. Arise, and put a cheerful courage on! The grave is not the end; nor will this huge globe, when it becomes a mere cinder, destitute of life, as it will do ultimately, if left to itself; nor will this whole visible universe, when universal stagnation, and therefore universal death, shall have seized it, be the end; for Christ hath gained the victory over death, and

hath opened to us the gate of everlasting life; of life that deserves the name, because it is essential and necessary, and can no more change or expire than can the Deity Himself, whose life it is!

This is the meaning of Easter Day; this is the meaning of every Lord's Day. A living Christ, not a dead Christ; a risen Christ, not a merely crucified Christ; an Invisible Universe, which shall abide for ever when all this visible universe shall have disappeared. "Of old hast Thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thy hands; they shall perish, but Thou endurest; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment, and as a vesture shalt Thou change them, and they shall be changed: but Thou art the same, and Thy years have no end. THE CHILDREN OF THY SERVANTS SHALL CONTINUE, AND THEIR SEED SHALL BE ESTABLISHED BEFORE THEE!"

THE MIRACLES OF APOSTOLIC AND MEDIÆVAL TIMES.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR T. G. BONNEY, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S., HONORARY CANON OF MANCHESTER AND EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP.

A SERMON PREACHED FOR THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE SOCIETY

"There shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect."—S. MATT. xxiv. 24.

CHRISTIANITY is now frequently attacked, in the following way. Critics select a particular case, and present to us alternative propositions; to take one side is a virtual surrender, to take the other speedily lands us in an absurdity. It is tacitly assumed that no third course is possible.

I purpose to notice briefly one of these attacks which was published in a recent number of a well-known periodical,* and probably has been read by many here present. The alternative which it offers to us amounts to this: miracles are asserted to have occurred frequently in the Middle Ages. In some instances the evidence by which they are supported is as good as can be produced in favour of those narrated in the New Testament. Will you believe both or neither? The difficulty is not a new one. No great theological learning is needed to convince us that, if the case proposed has not been already considered, it is exactly like others that have been discussed; but a seasoning of modern science acts as a stimulus to the mental palate.

Briefly, the story is this. In the earlier part of the ninth century there was living one Eginhard, secretary of Karl the Great, who, in his later years, founded a monastery of which he became abbot. He is anxious to enrich its church with some relics. A certain deacon from Rome intimates that for a consideration he can put Eginhard in possession of the relics of two saints named Marcellinus and Petrus. Eginhard sends him back to Rome in company with a trusty agent. The deacon, however, proves to be an impostor; he has promised to sell what he does not possess, so Eginhard's men steal the relics, and escape with them to Germany. As these are being conveyed to the church, where they were finally deposited, and after they have been enshrined there, numerous miracles are wrought, a few of which were witnessed by Eginhard.

Of all this he has left a record, which has come down to us in a manuscript which itself is of the tenth century. From it we also learn, that on the journey from Rome the chest containing the relics was secretly opened, and portions were stolen by the emissary of another abbot, and that Eginhard, after discovering his loss, did not easily get back the missing treasure. The induction which we are invited to draw is as follows: "In ordinary life Eginhard was a shrewd man of affairs and a sober historian, but no sooner is an appeal made to the religious (or superstitious) side of his nature than he appears to be almost as destitute of critical faculty as of moral sense." Indeed, throughout the story its chief actors seem about as conspicuous for their degraded knavery as for their fatuous credulity.

So we are expected to arrive at this conclusion: "If Eginhard's calm and objective narrative of the historical events of his time is no guarantee for the soundness of his judgment where the supernatural is concerned, the fervid rhetoric of the Apostle of the Gentiles, his absolute confidence in the inner light, and the extraordinary conception of the value and requirements of logical proof which he betrays in page after page of his epistles, afford still less security."

As it happens, I have given more attention than most people to some parts of St. Paul's writings, so may be pardoned for demurring to the censures thus glibly passed upon a highly inconvenient witness, whom it is of the utmost importance to discredit. I admit, indeed, that St. Paul thought and reasoned as a Jew and a man of the first century, not as a professor of Teutonic or Latin race, born in the nineteenth century; that, as he is speaking of things, which cannot be tested by the galvanometer or the microscope, his methods of reasoning are not always in accordance with those adopted in physical science, but they seem to me at least as sound and trustworthy as many which pass muster in metaphysical works of good repute.

This, however, it may be said is a matter of opinion, so we will pass on to consider briefly these three questions. (1.) What is a miracle? (2.) Have miracles ceased? (3.) Is there any

* *Nineteenth Century*, March, 1889: "The value of Witness to the Miraculous." (Professor Huxley.)

difference of importance between the miracles of Christ and His Apostles and those which are related by Eginhard, and similar authors?

1. Perhaps it may be well to remind you that three words are used in the Greek of the New Testament to designate the phenomena which are commonly, but vaguely, termed miraculous. These words may be rendered in English as marvels, signs, powers. The first refers simply to the effect upon the mind of the spectators, and may indicate nothing more than superior knowledge. The miracle here consists in the inexplicability of an event, so far as the witnesses were concerned. A "sign" may be in itself quite a common-place event, the whole significance being its occurrence at a particular juncture; the "miracle" here consisting in the coincidence. The last term—powers—predicates that certain persons can produce results which indicate the possession of exceptional power. Here, also, what would be called a miracle in one age would be in another an unusual and remarkable phenomena. From this it follows that the word miracle, so vaguely employed, has a very comprehensive sense, and includes a large number of phenomena which are only relatively miraculous, that is amazing and inexplicable. Hence the term miracle merely expresses an event as viewed from the standpoint, either of a past age or of our present knowledge. We include in it events for which we cannot discover an adequate cause among the modes of force known to us, and which, as they are connected with the religious sentiment, are referred to the direct or indirect intervention of the Almighty. But this mode of accounting for them obviously is no more than an expression of the dominant opinion of a particular epoch—the idea of "interference with the laws of nature"—though usual, is needless, and, as I think, misleading. The miracle may be the result of law as much as the fall of a stone, but of a law of infrequent operation; so that in regard to it the phrase "interference with law" is as inappropriate as it would be in the case of an electro-magnet, which, though it hinders a bar of iron from falling, so long as the current is passing, does not in any way interfere with the law of gravitation.

Further, we must not forget that these wonders, signs and powers, were not regarded by the Saviour or His immediate followers as conclusive proof of the validity of a commission or the truth of a message. The life of the prophet, the appeal of his doctrine to the conscience and moral sense of his auditors, were the only safe criteria. Christians are warned with much solemnity, and not seldom, as in the passage which I have taken for my text, that if they trusted only to the evidence of miracles, they might be deceived and led hopelessly astray. Another point also may be noticed in passing, that Christ would not work these miracles to gratify mere curiosity or stop the mouth of captious unbelief; and that the result often depended to no small extent on the mental attitude of the person relieved. Where men did not believe in Christ, there His power was not made manifest.

2. These considerations clear the way for an answer to the second question. Do miracles continue? If this question means—Have there been occurrences, since the close of the New Testament canon, which were connected with religious sentiment, and cannot be accounted for by any known physical causes—I reply, without hesitation, Certainly. You may think that I am making a rather large admission. If so, explain such things as the effect of bad news upon the health; the influence of the will, the phenomena—endless in their variety—of hysteria and its cure. In accounting for these you must appeal to forces, as you may call them, which are not strictly speaking physical. Such phenomena, from one point of view, might be justly called miracles, and such miracles continue to occur. I can believe that at Lourdes, La Salette, and other like places, the imagination—the faith in a certain sense—of the sufferers in some cases has wrought their cure. But you say that is no miracle. Well, you may find a place for it in your system of the universe; you may call it an effect of the imagination, or you may devise for it a long and magniloquent name, but in so doing you neither explain it nor make it a merely physical process, as I understand the word.

I must not be supposed to assert that all the miracles related in the New Testament can be classed with the above named. There are some which in all probability will always remain as miracles to man. I simply draw attention to the relativity of the term. As knowledge grows, the sphere of the natural enlarges by gain from the outer region of the supranatural, but even these additions bring us no nearer to the ultimate causes of things, and, turn where we will, true miracle ever confronts us.

3. There remains the question—Is there any difference of importance between the miracles recorded by Eginhard and those ascribed to the Saviour and His Apostles? Restricting ourselves to those for which the former vouches—and this seems to me justifiable, owing to the circumstances of the time—one, obviously, is no miracle at all, but merely a natural phenomenon. Some spots of a red fluid appear outside the coffer containing the relics; these, on the most insufficient evidence, simply as being a red fluid, are considered to be blood. This, had it been true, would have been a mere prodigy, and without a parallel in the New Testament. The other two may be classed with the cases of "faith healing" which I have already mentioned. You cannot explain them, you cannot ensure their occurrence like the result of an experiment, and so far they are miraculous. But I venture to affirm that had the coffer contained the bones of any other persons, or even had it been empty, the result would have followed, provided of

course the sufferer had not been aware of the change.

But there is another and yet more important difference—the character of the men and the nature of their teaching. Eginhard's emissaries steal the relics, he is a willing, nay, a joyful recipient of stolen property; others in turn rob him. As our critic remarks quite truly, we seem to be reading about the doings of a gang of horse copers. The desire to possess a collection of relics overpowers all sense of right and wrong; the worst of all evils has happened to the men of this age, their religious feelings have led them into notorious sin; to speak metaphorically, the devil has enshrined himself in the chapel of their souls; they are seeking to win entrance into the kingdom of heaven by deeds of evil. Is that the path which Christ and His Apostles indicated? Is that the way which leads to eternal life?

Again, what is the doctrine which these miracles supported and inculcated? It is that some scrap, whether of bone or rag, which has belonged, or is reputed to have belonged, to a holy man is a talisman of inestimable value. This doctrine might indeed be vaguely supported by an inferential interpretation of one or two incidents in the New Testament, but it is totally opposed to its direct statements. Charms, amulets, relics, and the like, are part and parcel of old world superstitions, which Christ would have had His Church abandon, but to which its members in their weakness too soon reverted. Then the last state became even worse than the first, Christianity in its superstition more degraded than Judaism, or even than some forms of heathenism. The taint yet lingers, its roots lie deep in human nature, and few branches of the Church, even in this nineteenth century, have wholly succeeded in purging themselves from it.

In the one case then we are dealing with representatives of Christianity at one of its lowest stages of degradation, a stage when men of perverted moral sense were constantly, almost greedily, expecting the miraculous to establish an immoral and thoroughly unchristian doctrine. Can that be said of the other case? The Apostles might be mistaken, they might be victims of an illusion, but can any man question their transparent honesty, their singleness of purpose, their perfect unselfishness, their noble self-devotion, their moral grandeur of life? Whither do we turn when we seek an approved standard of right and wrong; principles of conduct which have commended themselves to mankind, but to the pages of the New Testament, the chronicle of the lives, the words, the thoughts of these first missionaries of the Gospel of Christ. What would Paul, what would James, what would John have said of theft and fraud and lying, however pious the purpose? Their successors on such occasions have been too prone to indulge in euphemistic phrases; they would have used plain speech and strong words. With what withering scorn would Paul have spurned these old rags and bones, these ordinances worse than Jewish, these idolized relics of weak and fallible men. It is an insult to the Apostles to make the comparison. It betrays a complete inability to comprehend their moral position; it is as if one asserted that approved character and a life of honour counted for nothing in weighing testimony, and that the existence of perjured knaves rendered worthless the evidence of men of unsullied reputation. If we adopt such canons of criticism, whither shall we be landed? Because in politics there are self-seeking knaves, is there no such thing as an honest worker for the State? Because there are quacks in medicine, are we to sneer at all physicians? Because in science there has been careless observation, hasty generalization, loose induction and irresponsible chatter, are we to abandon all trust in it, and say that some truth may be there, but that we shall never find it?

What good are we to obtain from an Agnostic position? It is that which in science we should be most reluctant to accept, for it leaves us without a working hypothesis. Is it without its difficulties? I think not. Suppose we concede to it, that Christianity was born of a mixture of imposture and illusion, we have to account for many phenomena which are unique in the world's history, and for its place in the development of mankind. The latter seems to me not less inexplicable than the idea of a Divine Founder. There are difficulties in Christianity, the Agnostic urges—certainly there are. I know them well, and the weakness, fallibility and credulity of man. But there are difficulties also in Atheism, yet that creed—or rather no creed—seems to me logical compared with the position of the Agnostic who halts between two opinions, who neither asserts nor denies the existence of a God, who repudiates the name of Atheist, but excludes God from the world, who cannot make up his mind whether a Creator's love and a Creator's care have been guiding men on "stepping stones of their dead selves to higher things," or whether individual life is but a bubble on the stream, the course of nations like a river hasting to lose itself in the sands of the desert. "Behold we know not anything" is a poor creed for this weary world. With all its difficulties, with all its alleged imperfections, Christianity is easier to believe than that God made man, with all his capacities for loving and for suffering, and then left him to perish in the hurlyburly of life, where the individual counts for nothing, and there is no other hope but in the progress of the race. It is better, methinks, to accept the mystery of the Incarnation and the fact of the Resurrection, with their legitimate consequences, though they must ever remain to us as miracles beyond the sphere of scientific proof, and transcending our powers of thought, than to make ourselves the measure of all knowledge, and proclaim to the Creator "thus far shalt thou go and no farther."

PAMPHLET and Advice FREE

Every man and woman in search of HEALTH should write without delay to **Mr. C. B. HARNESS,** *Consulting Medical Electrician* (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his *New Medical Work*, entitled **"Harness' Guide to Health,"** which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of **Harness' Electropathic Belt** and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper.

MR. C. B. HARNESS also gives **Advice Free** of charge (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 15, 1889.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL TRIALS.

THE two great ecclesiastical causes have now passed their first stage, and we are disposed to think that the decision is in each case the most desirable one. We leave the legal aspect of the two cases to the lawyers—*chacun à son métier*—and wish to consider the present position of affairs only as it affects the interests of religion and truth. In the Bishop of Lincoln's case, the Archbishop has asserted, and will probably prove to have established, his right to act as a tribunal of the first instance in complaints against bishops. So far, so good. A bishop cannot set himself up as a lord over God's heritage, an autocrat without appeal. But then the court, to which his aggrieved diocesan subjects may resort, is itself episcopal; therefore devoted to the maintenance of hierarchical authoritity; therefore prejudiced in the accused bishop's favour. The archbishop's court, as a court of the first instance, may prove beneficial, but as a final court it would be intolerable—a sort of petty provincial papacy. We may, however, we think, rely upon the judges, that, when the Archbishop's future decision comes to be appealed against, they will maintain that fundamental principle of English law, and insurmountable obstacle to all aspiring ecclesiastics, the Royal Supremacy, "that the Queen is (as Bishop King and Archbishop Benson have both sworn) in all causes, and over all persons, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, within these her dominions supreme."

In the case of the reredos at St. Paul's, the Bishop of London's contention was that he had absolute power to bar the ecclesiastical courts against all complainant's whose plaint seemed to him personally one that it was not desirable to have publicly tried. It is impossible to imagine a more monstrous pretension on the part of a bishop than this deliberate refusal of justice. And singular indeed is the Nemesis of Fate, by which the principal part, in the assertion of episcopal autocracy, and the patronage of image-worship, has been reserved for Frederick Temple, of Balliol College, of Kneller Hall, of Rugby School, of Essays and Reviews.

However, both the causes will now be tried on their merits, and the public will see the arguments for and against all the fashionable idolatries, which have been recently revived—the worship of images, the worship of the Virgin, and the worship of the Host. Every one knows in his heart, and none more clearly than the three prelates involved in these proceedings, that the real question at issue is, whether the Church of England shall tolerate within her sanctuaries these three idolatries.

CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE SOCIETY.

THE annual meeting of the above Society was held on May 16th, at Exeter Hall, Sir William Thomson (Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Glasgow) presiding. The Bishop of Ballarat moved the adoption and circulation of the report, stating that he was surprised at the variety and amount of work done with so very small an income. The agents of the Society claimed and got a fair hearing, and provided an antidote to the poison of unbelief. Infidel lecturers must be followed, or working men would naturally think no answer was possible. If there was much infidelity, there was also a tendency to return to faith in scientific circles, and amongst infidel leaders. The Society ought to be supplied with the means to provide simple Christian evidence tracts. There was much cultured scepticism, Agnostics even going to the Holy Communion. But better have objections openly discussed in periodicals than allowed to fester inwardly. The Rev. T. Vincent Tymms (author of "The Mystery of God"), in seconding the resolution, pointed out that the early Christians had to defend their faith, and referred to the fact that John Wesley began his itinerant preaching just two years after the publication of Butler's "Analogy." He attributed much of the success of the former to the preparatory work of the latter. Bishop French (late of Lahore) bore testimony to the great help the Society gave to Missionaries, and to the profound veneration which Moslems and others had for the character of Jesus Christ. Professor Bonney (formerly President of the Geological Society) then moved a vote of thanks to the chairman, paying a brief tribute to his pre-eminent scientific attainments. He added that Sir W. Thomson, as a layman, could not be accused of being biassed by fear of losing his income, and in taking the chair he rendered a service to Christianity not easy to estimate. The speaker referred in the frankest terms to the shameful attacks made by Christians in the past on scientific men, and besought Christians of to-day to lay aside all suspicions of science, which would greatly aid religion. Mr. W. K. Parker (formerly Hunterian Professor at the Royal College of Surgeons) stated

that he was not an unbeliever, though he was an evolutionist and a Darwinian. When he left his father's farm to study science a lady said to him, "William, read your Bible every day," and William did, but he did not read the Bible only once a day now. After fifty years he was not likely to lose sight of Christ, Who was his life. He knew more about real life in Him than in biology. What were the bits and ends of knowledge to an evolutionist compared to Christ, the hope of glory? The more childlike we were in science, as in religion, the better. Geological and biological science did not touch the Scriptures in the least. They were not to think that because people had tried to get rid of Christianity through evolution, the two were really opposed. Scientific men should study science, and spend a deal more of their time on their knees. The Rev. R. Redford (late Professor of Apologetics at New College, London) supported the motion in the name of the committee. He had watched the operations of the Society from the beginning, and thought it ought to receive much more pecuniary support. A new Freethought propaganda in the north-east of England showed they must be up and doing. Sir William Thomson, in replying, said:—"I have long felt that there is a general impression somehow or other in the non-scientific world, that science has discovered ways of explaining all the facts of nature without adopting any definite belief in a Creator. I have never felt otherwise than that belief is utterly groundless. When a scientific man says — as it has been said from time to time—that there is no God, it seems to me that he does not express his own ideas clearly. He is perhaps struggling with difficulties, he is out of his depth. We all are when we approach the subject of life. The scientific man in looking at matter, wondering what it will do, thinking over the results of certain combinations which he can impose upon it, declares that there is something beyond a mass of dead matter. His very thought is in itself a contradiction to the idea that there is nothing but dead matter. Science can do little positively towards the objects of the Society, but it can do something which is vital and fundamental. It can show that what we see in the world of dead matter and of life is not a result of fortuitous atoms. St. Peter speaks of scoffers who said that 'all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation,' but affirms himself that 'all these things shall be dissolved.' It seems to me that even physical science absolutely demonstrates the scientific truth of these words. In science, as in morals and politics, there is no periodicity. Whatever we prophesy of the future, it will be unlike the past. Everything is in a state of evolution and progress. The science of dead matter, which has been my chief life study, is strenuous on the point that the age of the world is definite."

Reviews and Notices.

"The Expositor." June, 1889. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Dr. Jessopp's paper, Primitive Liturgies and Confessions of Faith, is exceedingly interesting. The writer's contention is that the four terms ὁ λόγος, ἡ διδαχή, ἡ ὁδός, and ἡ πίστις are practically convertible terms, and refer to a Formulated Summary of Christian Primitive Doctrine. The paper is not to us any less interesting because we think Dr. Jessopp has set himself to prove too much. Even the opening sentence of his argument—"That something like a dogmatic confession of faith was drawn up very soon after the ascension of our Lord, appears from the nature of the case more than probable" seems a little too strong. Surely dogmatic confessions of faith are not formulated till that faith becomes questioned. The apostles began by preaching the Resurrection, and that was a fact which required stating and proving rather than defining. All Dr. Jessopp says about St. Paul's use of the word γνῶσις is very interesting, and is perhaps the most convincing part of his paper. We quote his interpretation of 1 Cor. xi. 6, as it may interest others as much as it has interested us. "St. Paul," he writes, "is contrasting his own claims to be listened to with those put forth by the false teachers at Corinth. 'For,' says he, 'I reckon myself in no respect to have fallen short of the chiefest apostles,' for though an unofficial person as regards the λόγος, I am not so in regard of the γνῶσις; *i.e.*, in the drawing up of the first elementary summary of Christian doctrine I took no part, for I was no apostle then; yet in the fuller and more developed exposition of the faith — the γνῶσις —I did take my part, and my apostleship was acknowledged."

The paper called The Image and the Stone, by Josiah Gilbert is, as the name implies, really a sermon on Nebuchadnezzar's vision. It is an uncommonly good sermon, and any clergyman intending to preach thereon when the Book of Daniel is being read in the course of the Sunday Lessons, will do well to read Mr. Gilbert's paper. Dean Chadwick's remarks on the Minor Figures amongst the apostles are good, but contain nothing very striking. Professor Stokes on St. Columbanus and his Library, supplies a good historical paper, and Professor Bruce continues his exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

We have received a pamphlet written by Mr. Frederick Parker, of Furness Lodge, Parker's Place, Cambridge, and printed by Medcalfe and Sons, Cambridge, entitled An Answer to the Objections to the Divinity of Jesus Christ, etc., etc., made by the Rev. Charles Voysey, B.A. Mr. Parker writes with ability, but with too much passion. He has read his Bible, and what is more, has thought about it—a thing not much done in the present day.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

CLANDESTINE MARRIAGES.

Sir,—The writer of the article on "Clandestine Marriages" in your issue of last Saturday displays the usual prejudice and the usual lack of knowledge with reference to civil marriages which one invariably finds when the subject is touched upon in clerical journals. Although the article in question is of an editorial character, I am emboldened by your well-known impartiality and courtesy in admitting letters on both sides of the various questions discussed in your paper to ask permission to say something upon the subject, premising that an experience gained during nearly thirty years, of both church and civil

marriages, may be presumed to warrant me in offering some observations thereon.

First as to matters of fact. Your article repeats the old fallacy in speaking of the register office as an aid to clandestine marriages. The experience of those well qualified to judge shows the contrary to be the fact. There could not possibly be a better authority on the point than the late Registrar-General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages, who, as the result of many year's experience, and examination of statistics and reports bearing upon the matter, stated on several occasions that, proportionately to the whole number of marriages, clandestine marriages were more frequent among persons married at church than among register office marriages. And any one having actual knowledge of the working of the two respective methods must admit that the regulations governing register office marriages are far more stringent than those laid upon the clergy. To any one possessed of that knowledge it is difficult to understand what is meant by the hypothetical case of the "two factory hands" adduced in the article, or how such a case bears upon the point. Does not the writer know that persons can only be married at the register office of the district in which they reside, and not at an office "eight or ten miles away?" And as to the comparative publicity of the two methods of publication, I venture to say that the one mode is quite as public as the other. For, out of the entire population of any parish, how few there are who attend church where the banns are published. Moreover, it is very easy, as your contributor hints, to evade the publication of banns in one's own parish church. I have known of several persons who, to avoid gossip, &c., have had their banns published in parishes to which they were complete strangers. Nothing easier. A room hired for a few days; a visit to the parish clerk; no questions asked; all taken for granted, and the matter is accomplished as quietly as in the register office, for who among a congregation wearily listening to the list of names as read in church would be likely to recognise those of "John Smith and Mary Jones" any more than a casual visitor to the superintendent registrar's office would recognise them there? As a matter of ascertained fact, at the latter place there is more opportunity for discovering and preventing improper marriages; the names and all particulars as to parties intending to be married are openly exhibited for at least twenty-one days to every person entering the office. At the Church, on the contrary, it is only those who happen to be present when the banns are read that have any chance of learning the names of intending candidates for matrimony. Again, with regard to marriages by licence, even your contributor must admit that the Church gives no greater publicity than the register office, for there is absolutely no publication of any kind, whereas at the office the notice must be duly entered in the book prescribed by law, and which is always open to inspection.

The writer of the article is also in error with respect to the question of expense. The lowest fee for which parties can be married at the register office is 9s. 7d. (including certificate and stamp) if both persons live within the same district, or 11s. 7d if resident in different districts. Compared with 8s 6d., which the article states is the usual church fee, it would appear that the latter is the cheaper, and in most poor districts this is so. I know a clergyman who, on asking a non-religious person who desired to be married at his church, why he did not go to the register office as being more suitable to a man of his opinions and mode of life, received as his reply: "*Because it is cheaper to be married at church.*"

Upon the religious aspect of the question, by which I mean the idea that marriages at a church secures some spiritual advantage and blessing, irrespective of the state of heart of the parties concerned, I can say but little. It would occupy too much of your limited space to discuss that matter, even if you would permit it, and I suppose it would be futile to attempt to alter the opinions of one who is so prejudiced, as to imply that civil marriage is an *error* to be repented of. What can be the value of a religious service to people who are neither Church folk nor believers, many of whom, during the whole course of their lives, never enter a place of worship except on their wedding day? What spiritual benefit can we imagine the Church can call down upon a couple who, to judge from the unseemly levity too often witnessed, are not at all in a frame of mind appropriate to the performance of a religious act, but whose thoughts are of the earth earthy? I have heard a man jeeringly boast that he had never been inside a church except when he went there to get married, and can we believe that a blessing is more likely to descend upon such a man simply because, to suit his own convenience or pocket, he marries at a church instead of a register office. It is of course right from our point of view as Christians and Churchmen to make every important step in life an occasion for godly meditation, and for asking the blessing of the Almighty, but to those who live without God in the world, surely the better course is to go where His Holy name is not introduced and consequently not profaned. I know of no scriptural prohibition of what the article writer calls non-religious marriage, but I do know of a positive command against taking God's name in vain, and as it is unhappily the case that there are so many of the indifferent and irreligious class, but to whom marriage is a necessity, it is well that the law provides for them as well as for the religious members of the community.

But it must not be for a moment supposed that civil marriage is only intended for those who, unfortunately, are irreligious; far from it. There are many God-fearing persons — members of Nonconformist Churches and others—whose lives are as blameless as those of the most devout Churchmen, who are conscientiously of opinion that marriage in itself is *not a religious act*, but adhere to the definition of it as a "civil contract," and therefore prefer that the solemnisation thereof should be confined to a civil ceremony. If outwardly happy lives as the result of marriage may be considered as implying that God's blessing has rested upon it, there are hundreds of religious people who have been so married, and who can testify to having been the recipients of such blessing, and I venture to think that the legislature, in providing for the marriage of persons entertaining these opinions with regard to matrimony, did a wise and just thing.

With reference to the suggestion in your article as to the reading of the Marriage Service over persons already married, it will be necessary for the clergy to be careful in adopting that procedure. Persons already married cannot, as a rule, be re-married, and any one who makes a pretence of marrying over again those who have been lawfully joined in matrimony will run the risk of incurring certain penalties, for, after all, what constitutes marriage? Not the particular ceremony by which two persons are joined together for life, and which may vary in different

countries, and under different faiths, but that legal ratification of such conjoining which secures to the parties married the sanction and protection of the law of the land, and which imposes upon them duties and responsibilities towards each other, and towards society thenceforward not to be evaded: This once achieved by a legal process, it appears to be somewhat doubtful whether it is competent for a clergyman to go through the marriage ceremony, except in certain cases (*e.g.*, that of persons married in France) over parties who have already been properly married.

A REGISTRAR AND CHURCHMAN.

PRAYERS TO THE SECOND PERSON OF THE TRINITY.

SIR,—In the review of Ken's works in to-day's PULPIT, it is said that there are no prayers in the Prayer Book addressed to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, except in the Litany. This is too sweeping, indeed it is incorrect. The Collect for the third Sunday in Advent is so addressed; and there is one prayer in the office for the Visitation of the Sick so addressed, and one in the Burial Service. Besides, the hymn *Te Deum Laudamus* is a hymn addressed to Christ: we praise Thee (who art) God being the proper rendering, and not the opening words of the Prayer Book version.

I find it difficult to understand what your reviewer intends, where he speaks of making one person of the Holy Trinity exclude the other persons, nor what he means by the part that "Rome" has taken in this. It is almost characteristic of the Grecian liturgies and hymns to be addressed to our Lord Christ, not by any means so of those of any branch of the western church. It is true that of late the sects of the Salvation Army School much affect hymns, nearly all of a mean literary class, addressed to our Lord, generally by His name of "Jesus." But the Roman Churches have adopted no such error as making all terminate in our Lord's human nature, nor is there any connection between even the most exclusive views of His Incarnation, and the gross views of the Eucharist which the review alludes to. Roman error concerning the Trinity consists practically in the introduction into it of a *fourth* person, the Virgin mother; and the worst part of Roman error about the Eucharist is the doctrine of the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice, which is no *extension*, as it is somewhat awkwardly termed, of our Lord's Incarnation, but an inferential denial of it and of its meaning.

B.

8th June, 1889.

THE MINISTRY OF EVIL.

SIR,—I notice in the PULPIT of the 8th the following words quoted by your correspondent "J. B." from a sermon by the Bishop of Manchester:—

"Election having for its object not the weal or woe of individuals, but the blessing and redemption of the whole human race."

In illustration of this truth, as I firmly believe it is, I hope you will permit me to quote the following from an article of my own in the *Expositor* (second series, vol. 7, 1884), entitled "St. Paul on Predestination."

"Let us inquire the meaning of the 16th verse of Romans xi. 16: 'If the firstfruit is holy, so is the lump; and if the root is holy, so are the branches.'" . . . . .

I venture to suggest that the lump represents the human race, and the firstfruit the elect Israel, the seed of Abraham, who is not only holy and blessed himself, but a blessing to all the nations of the earth. . . . . This is consistent with St. Paul's use of the metaphor elsewhere: "Christ the firstfruit; then they that are Christ's at His coming" (1 Cor. xv. 23). Moreover, the same metaphor is used by St. James, who had much more in common with St. Paul than many are inclined to admit. . . . He says, "Of His own will begat He us by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of His creatures," (James i. 18). . . . I see no danger of error in uniting the passage from St. James with that from St. Paul, and reading on from the one to other thus: "He begat us, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of His creatures. And if the firstfruit is holy, so is the lump."

Darwin has shown that when the Creator purposes to improve a race, His method is not to improve the entire race together, but to call into existence improved, or elect individuals, by a process which is called spontaneous variation, because nothing whatever is known of its cause or *modus operandi;* and these become the parents of an improved race. The same is true in the moral and spiritual world. All human progress is due to elect individuals—elect not only to be a blessing to themselves, but still more to be a blessing to multitudes of others. This analogy between the merely organic and the spiritual world is as real, and I think more important, than any contained in that much and justly praised book, Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World." The so-called doctrine of election is a fact of nature.

And in connection with this nature reveals another fact, that all disease and evil, physical and moral, tend to their own destruction, so that the horrible imagination of a vengeance which has no purpose beyond itself, which neither reforms nor destroys its victims, is contrary to all the analogies of the natural world.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 10th June, 1889.

IMMORTAL LOVE.

MARRIAGE, though holy, is for earth;
But Love, matured on earth, remains
To those who, in the second birth,
Rise free from earthly stains.

Beyond the rocks and shoals of Time,
The shoreless and unfathomed sea
Extends, unchangeably sublime,
Of God's Eternity;

And far beyond our mortal gaze
Extends, and high as Heaven above
Life's drifting clouds and fleeting haze,
Unchanged, immortal Love.

M.

ERRATUM.—In article on "Aunt or Stepmother," in last Saturday's PULPIT, twelfth line from top, *for* "House of Lords" *read* "House of Commons."

HYMN.

For use from Rogation to Harvest. Adapted to (unpublished) music by ALFRED J. CALDICOTT, Mus. Bac.

HAVE mercy on the youthful hearts
Sown with Thy gracious Word ;
On all who have the message heard,
Kyrie Eleison.
The land in Spring's green garb arrayed,
With sun and shower vouchsafe to bless,
O Christ, the Son of Righteousness,
Kyrie Eleison.

On those who've reached life's summer time,
Whilst snares beset their way,
Oh, let their strength be as their day,
Kyrie Eleison.
Preserve from blight our ripening grain,
And make our trees to bear their fruit ;
Let not our flocks and herds be mute,
Kyrie Eleison.

Lord, at Thy final gathering in,
May there be reaped for Thee
The souls who prayed so fervently,
Kyrie Eleison.
When, with the song of harvest home,
Unto Thy Temple we repair,
This is the answer to our prayer,
Kyrie Eleison.

Have mercy, Lord ! O Father, Son,
And Holy Spirit hear !
This cry goes up from far and near,
Kyrie Eleison.
This universal Litany
Ascends to God the One in three ;
From those who pray on bended knee,
Kyrie Eleison.

AMEN.

THE electors have fulfilled an expectation which was very generally entertained, and appointed the Rev. V. H. Stanton to the Ely Professorship of Divinity at Cambridge. Mr. Stanton has filled the offices of Hulsean Lecturer and Whitehall Preacher, and has for some years past acted as a Theological Lecturer in Trinity College. He has been examining chaplain both to the late and the present Bishop of Ely ; and there is a certain fitness in his appointment to a chair which is endowed with a canonry in that cathedral.

WITH the object of freeing the Church of England Working Men's Society from debt incurred by its active operations on behalf of the Church, an exhibition of ecclesiastical art has been organised in the Portman-rooms, Baker-street, under the direction of the secretary, Mr. C. Powell. Some thirty firms, including many prominent makers of artistic and ecclesiastical furniture and accessories, are among the exhibitors ; but the chief interest centres in the extremely valuable and interesting loan collection, comprising nearly 500 relics and curios connected with Church art. Cardinal Manning has kindly lent a number of vestments, including several beautiful chasubles, stoles, and albs.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Beresford-Peirse, Rev. W., Curate of St. Mary, Redcliff, Bristol ; Vicar of Fulford, near York.

Bowman, Rev. A. Gerald, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Westminster ; Vicar of St. Mark's, Kennington.

Butcher, Rev. E., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Cordelia*.

Cole, Rev. T. E. F., Curate-in-Charge of Wateringbury, Kent ; H.M. Chaplain, Bengal Presidency.

Corfe, Rev. Charles John, M.A., R.N., Honorary Chaplain to the Duke of Edinburgh.

Davies, Rev. George D., B.A., St. David's College, Lampeter, Curate-in-Charge of St. Mary's, Bury Port ; Vicar of Marloes Pembrokeshire.

Dun, Rev. James, B.A., Vicar of Higham Ferrers-cum-Chelveston, Northamptonshire.

Fullerton, Rev. S. Hewitt, B.A. ; Missions to Seamen Chaplain, Plymouth.

Haslope, Rev. L. Melvill, Curate of St. Andrew's, Westminster ; Chaplain on the Bombay Establishment.

Henville, Rev. Edward, M.A., Rector of Chipping Warden, Northamptonshire.

Hodges, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Bury St. Edmund's ; Rural Dean of Thingoe.

Inman, Rev. E., Vicar of Gillingham ; Honorary Canon of Beminster Prima in Salisbury Cathedral.

Northcote, Hon. and Rev. J. S., Rector of Upton Pyne, Devon ; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Westminster.

Peile, Rev. A. L. B., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Ventnor, Honorary Chaplain to the Queen ; Master and Chaplain of St. Katherine's Hospital, Regent's Park.

Perry, Rev. R. E., Rector of Aldham, Colchester.

Quennell, Rev. W., Vicar of Tring ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Hertford.

Roberts, Rev. Griffith, Rector of Dowlais ; Canon of Llandaff Cathedral.

Ryder, Rev. Algernon Charles Dudley, Vicar of Highcliffe, near Christchurch.

Sowter, Rev. Francis Briggs, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Weymouth ; Archdeacon of Dorset.

Spencer, Rev. T. Barton, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Preston ; Acting Chaplain 1st Volunteer Battalion Loyal North Lancashire Regiment.

Westbrook, Rev. F. S., M.A., Chaplain H.M. Prison, Nottingham ; Chaplain H.M. Prison, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brooke, Rev. John, Vicar of St. Katherine's, Northampton, son of the late J. Brooke, of the Rydings, Brighouse, at Northampton, on the 31st ult., aged 38.

Goslett, Rev. Edward Maynard, LL.D., for nineteen years Rector of the parish, at Colby Rectory, Aylsham, on the 1st inst., aged 66.

Hopkins, Rev. Gerard M., S.J., B.A. Oxon, F.R.U.I., Professor of Classical Literature at University College, Dublin, of typhoid fever, on the 8th inst., aged 44.

Hughes, Rev. Sir T. Collingwood, Bart., at Little Billing Rectory, Northampton, on the 22nd ult. aged 88.

Marshall, Rev. W. Arthur, late Chaplain of All Saints' School, at Bloxham, on the 3rd inst., aged 34.

Miller, Rev. Robert Kalley, M.A., late Professor of Mathematics, Royal Naval College, Greenwich, at Medbourne House, Tunbridge Wells, on the 2nd inst., aged 46.

Philpot, Rev. Benjamin, M.A., late Rector of Dennington, and formerly Archdeacon of the Isle of Man, at Mona Lodge, Oak Hill, Surbiton, on the 28th ult., aged 98.

Rawle, Right Rev. Richard, D.D., late Bishop of the Church of England in Trinidad, at Codrington College, Barbados, on the 10th ult.

Saint, Rev. John James, Rector of Speldhurst for fifty-nine years, and late Rural Dean of South Malling, at Groombridge Place, Kent, on the 6th inst., in his 90th year.

Shaw, Rev. W. M., M.A., for thirty-two years Vicar of Yealand Conyers, North Lancashire, at the Vicarage, on the 30th ult., aged 70.

Snow, Rev. John Pennell, for nearly fourteen years the Vicar of the parish, eldest surviving son of the late B. G. Snow, Esq., of Highgate, at Melton Vicarage, Ross, on the 5th inst.

Stocker, Rev. William Henry Browell, Rector of Ovington, Alresford, Hants, formerly Vicar of Horsforth, Leeds, on the 10th inst., in his 82nd year.

Wilkinson, Rev. Bernard, second son of the late Rev. J. B. Wilson, at Aden, on the 3rd inst., aged 29.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE DIGNITY OF WORK.

By the Rev. L. R. RAWNSLEY, M.A., Curate of Hornsey.

Sermon Preached in Hornsey Parish Church, on Sunday Evening, May 19th, 1889.

"Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed."—2 Tim. ii. 15.

TIMOTHY had been entrusted with the work of an Evangelist, and it was, therefore, necessary that he should seek for God's approval, endeavour to labour without disgracing himself or his cause, and, even as a good workman rightly handles his tools, and rightly divides the timber, minister the Word efficiently and skilfully, Every person entrusted with spiritual tasks knows how hard it is to banish thoughts of man's approval, when only God's approval should be cared for. If I do not err in judging others by my own spiritual experience, I should say that all spiritual workers, whether clergy, Sunday-school teachers, or district visitors, have to conquer, or be conquered by the temptation to grow half-hearted and to justify themselves because others have no heart for the work; to see cause for shame in the way they perform their duties, and to excuse themselves because they are not compelled to do these duties, or because they are fulfilling other responsibilities worthily. Clergymen are tempted, as my own conscience testifies to my sorrow, to think what praise people may give to their sermons or their speeches; Sunday-school teachers are tempted to think more of interesting than of influencing their scholars; district visitors to be more attentive to those who are already leading the Christian life, than to those who give no thought to Christ, and perhaps small civility to Christ's servants. These are our temptations, and are only to be subdued by studying to show ourselves approved to God, and workmen that need not to be ashamed. If we wish to rightly handle the Word of Truth we must have noble motives, and we must have conscientious principles and live up to them.

It is not my intention to-night to confine my words merely to spiritual duties; I wish to speak generally on the dignity of labour, and to repeat St. Paul's advice to every person present, whatever be his station in life, whatever be his labour: "Study to show thyself approved unto God a workman that needeth not to be ashamed."

This advice will be fittingly introduced by asking you to believe in God, both as the busiest and the most conscientious worker. Pagans imagined gods who passed lives free from care, and busied themselves little with the affairs of men. This belief could only lead to one result. Pleasure was felt to be godlike, and the chief desire of life. Men listened to the teachings of Epicurus, and exclaimed, "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Their religion could not withstand this motto when men said about the gods:

They lie beside their nectar, and the bolts are hurled
Far below them in the valleys, and the clouds are lightly curled
Round their golden houses, girdled with the gleaming world;
Where they smile in secret, looking over wasted lands,
Blight and famine, plague and earthquake, roaring deeps and fiery sands,
Clanging fights and flaming towns, and sinking ships, and praying hands;
But they smile, they find a music centred in a doleful song,
Steaming up, a lamentation, and an ancient tale of wrong,
Like a tale of little meaning, though the words are strong.

Certainly the gods proclaimed by Epicurus and his disciples were no gods for sorrowing, toiling humanity; no gods for men, the brain-workers and the hand-workers; no gods for women, the heart-workers. Believe me, humanity wants amidst life's labours, as well as amidst life's sorrows, a high priest, a God "who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities." Men who must work if you, your wives and little ones are to eat; women, who must work if home is to be bright, cheerful, and happy, if husband and children are to rise up and call you blessed. Christ proclaims the God whom you can turn to for sympathy when He says, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." Christ proclaims the Father as a worker, careful of even the minutest details, numbering the very hairs of our head, and watching the fall of the one sparrow thought so insignificant as to be thrown into the bargain of him who chose to spend two farthings and obtain five sparrows, rather than purchase two sparrows for one farthing. Christ also teaches us that God is a methodical worker, having times and seasons in His power which it does not become man to know; while St. Paul represents God as waiting for the fulness of time to come ere He sent His Son to be incarnate and redeem the world. These revelations of God's Word are now being fully confirmed by what Natural Science is teaching men of Nature's God. Professor Dallinger in a recent lecture on "The Infinitely great and the Infinitely little," showed that the same perfection of workmanship was evident, whether we contemplated the distant planets, or examined the smallest mites under the microscope. Moreover, the whole tendency of recent scientific research has been to make it highly probable that all the regular successions of

natural phenomena, which we call laws, will be found belonging to one great scheme, and that besides believing in One God, we shall come to know one law.

We shall be helped in our toils by thinking of God as the great worker; we shall further be helped by thinking of God's motive. This is nothing else than His own inherent goodness and love. God's work is wrought for no reward; God is independent of man's praise. In love and wisdom hath He wrought all His works, and however unfaithful man may be in his duties, God remains faithful, for He cannot deny Himself, cannot cease to be "Perfect in Power, in Love, and Purity."

My reason for laying stress on this truth, revealed alike by God's Word and God's world, is that in our endeavours to meet God's approval, we may know what conduct God is likely to require, and also feel that what God requires God has a right to expect. I very much fear that work is looked upon by too many as a curse, and that their opinion of God is of one who has placed us in a condition where hard work is a necessity, while He Himself enjoys endless rest. To such the dignity of work has never been made manifest; such have never felt that in doing their best conscientiously, they are influenced by a godlike spirit in the great army of toilers, of which God is the chief. "To labour is to pray," was a maxim of St. Augustine's, and surely they whose lives are spent in active efforts that duties may be fulfilled, and their fellows helped, may offer God their tasks both in spirit and in word. Some of you may have different ideals to live for than a life of honest work. Some of you may long for wealth which will secure you beautiful dwellings, abundance of food, and constant leisure. This is the Socialist's dream to-day. Ask yourselves, however, who is going to build your dwellings, who is going to labour to procure your food? Your ordinary articles of food have to be prepared at the expense of much labour, and cannot be distributed save by human agencies. It is, in fact, impossible for us to lessen labour, save we thrust back our civilisation. I have spoken of the longing which some have to be rich without toil. Remember that that wish indulged has confined many a man to the restraints and hardships of penal servitude, who, had he chosen to labour and to wait, could have been happy in his own home. There are women whose ideal of bliss is to be petted by an indulgent husband, whose work will gain for their wives luxury and comfort. They have no wish to enjoy the love of children, and through mere selfish laziness, cowardice, or self-diffidence, hate the very thought that they may have one day to undertake the duty of rearing and training children. Again, there are mothers who neglect their children, who leave them to the too exclusive care of servants, or suffer them to roam neglected in the streets; mothers who compassionate themselves because they have children, and complain that children are so tiresome. Tired, enduring, self-sacrificing mothers are many; so plentiful, indeed, that their goodness sheds the brightest human beams amidst the world's darkness. I would like all women to try and throw one such light upon their homes and in the world. The lazy and the cowardly and self-diffident women reply, "It is all very well for men to talk, they have not this work to do." I grant that the lion's share of this work falls upon the women, but perhaps it has never been suggested to the murmurers that God gives the men their work, and gives the women theirs. Each should try to win God's approval, each seek to hear Christ say, "Well done, good and faithful servant." All living creatures must needs exert themselves in the struggle for existence. Man rises above the brutes by voluntarily undertaking toil for others' good, and as he rises thus by conscientious work above the brutes, so, too, he rises nearer God. He ceases to imagine bliss can only be found in leisure; from his work he derives happiness, and despising the dreams of those who imagine that the golden year has been and is passed, as well as the dreamers who place it in the far off future, hearken to the din of the workman's tools, the noise of the factory, and roar of the streets, and says:

> Well, I know
> That unto him who works, and feels he works,
> This same grand year is ever at the doors.

"Study to show thyself approved unto God." God looked down upon His work, and saw that it was good. Pray that God may approve of your work, and see that it is good. Do any of you think, "These are high-flown phrases suitable enough for those whose tasks are carried on before the eyes of men who can admire and praise. The ideal, however, seems far too exalted for those whose work is like their lives, obscure, and to whose lot falls small share of praise." Well, my Christian brothers and sisters, I will cease a moment from my own words, and tell you something that happened eighteen centuries ago. Some Christians had assembled together in one of the largest towns of Asia Minor, to hear a letter read from the man who had first preached the Gospel to them, and who was then in prison. Some of them were slaves, completely at the disposal of their masters and mistresses, with no hopes of ever taking a high position in life, and scarcely a hope of ever being free. They had to perform the most menial duties, they could be insulted and degraded with impunity. They heard how Christ had preached peace to them; they heard that they were fellow-citizens of the saints. The letter exhorted them all to follow God as His children. Counsel was offered to husbands and wives, to children and to fathers, and then they heard that the letter contained an especial message to them. "Slaves be obedient to them that are

your masters according to the flesh with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart as unto Christ, not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart." Those men were the natives of Ephesus; the writer was the Apostle St. Paul. We pray to-day "Thy will be done," and if it is God's will that we should serve Him by serving others, let us seek to win His approval by living our prayer. Think not that the task is insignificant. I would say to servants here, much of the happiness and comfort of those with whom you live depends on your faithful and conscientious discharge of your duties. Let your lives be ennobled by the knowledge that you are by your painstaking industry adding to the happiness of those who employ you; and to the whole congregation I would say, "What is worth doing is worth doing well." By carefulness in minute details, by regularity and punctuality in the exercise of your daily duties "Study to show yourselves approved unto God." It has been said that there would be fewer heroes if battles were fought in the dark. God would have us all act heroically, though our actions never win praise from the world. God would have us remember that to Him the darkness and the light are both alike. Would that we could do obscure duties as well and faithfully as the monk represented as being proud of the manuscript he had copied, and saying

> Yes, I might almost say to the Lord,
> Here is a copy of Thy Word,
> Written out with much toil and pain:
> Take it, O Lord, and let it be
> As something I have done for Thee.

St. Paul counselled Timothy to show himself approved unto God, he also wanted him to be in God's sight "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." It was the glory of the French Knight Bayard to have the reputation of being "without fear, and without reproach." If we to-day would be without fear, we must also be without reproach. As a rule when shame overtakes a man, it is because others have seen the error, the failure, or the negligence, which he was the first to see himself. We may have the best intentions, and yet make mistakes, or be deceived; we may strive our hardest and have to admit that we have failed. Our hearts may condemn us, but God is greater than our hearts, and knoweth all things; and when He judges us, He will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart, and then will every man have praise of God. May we pray that it may not be said to any of us in that day "Thou wicked and slothful servant." May we remember that the service St. Paul would have us render unto God is not only a life that is "fervent in spirit," but also one that is "not slothful in business."

Here let me say that no other motive of work can remain sure save the desire to win God's approval. Those there are whose toils are sweetened and cheered by dreams of the earthly home they are going to make, and the earthly love they are going to gain. That love may be denied them, and then, if life is not to be wasted and dishonoured, they need a new motive to support them in their toils. If all learned to do their work as to the Lord and not unto men, we should not hear of men in the hour of disappointment, and misery, destroying with their own hands the life which God gave for noble ends, and going into the presence of the Judge they were too faithless to trust, too cowardly to serve. Those there may be here to-night who, miserable and disappointed ask, "what have I got to live for?" To them as a brother, and with a brother's sympathy, I say, Live for God's honour and glory; live to help others who may share your misery.

Cobden found John Bright in the hour when his life was clouded because his young wife lay dead, and speaking to him of other lives wretched as his own, of other homes blighted by poverty and hunger, he persuaded him to live for the sake of procuring cheap bread for the masses of his countrymen. John Bright has now entered into his rest, and God has received his soul. We are richer as a nation because of his example; our workers have an easier struggle for bread, because a brave man in his misery felt for others, and lived to do God's work. Never may it be said of one of us, "Being wretched himself, he had no thought for others, and sinking in his misery dragged down others with him;" rather may it be said, "He tasted the bitterness of grief, and in loving sympathy went forth to sweeten the cups which, but for him, others must needs have drained to their sorrow." There can be no safe guiding principle in life except the desire to win God's approval. This principle can alone be trusted to sustain us when we are heavy laden with disappointment and bereavement, and when we think too readily that God will give us no more happiness.

In the endeavour to study to win God's approval we have the aid of Christ's example. Think of Him as He rises up a great while before dawn to pray; as He journeys from city to city, preaching the glad tidings that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. Hear Him as He tells the disciples, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work." Hear Him again, as He says before His passion, "I have glorified Thee on the earth: I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do." Hearken to that last cry on the Cross, "It is finished," and then endeavour so to fulfil your EARTHLY tasks that you too may say, "It is finished," before you depart from the body to be with the Lord. Christ's heavenly work is not yet finished. He is preparing a place for us. So, too, to day many of our religious thinkers share the opinion of Clough:

We hope
That in a world of larger scope,
What here is faithfully begun,
Will be completed, not undone.

Tennyson's "In Memoriam" is full of the same idea. I quote the shortest and simplest passage:

I know transplanted, human worth
Will bloom to profit other-where.

Again, Canon Luckock, in a paper read last year at the Manchester Church Congress, imagined that the spirits of the righteous may be preaching to heathen spirits in an intermediate state, who, while living, never heard of Christ. He says, "Such a belief will help us to understand the mystery of Divine Providence, when God cuts short the earthly career of one whose life, as man judges, is of priceless value to the Church. The influence, the preaching, the ministrations are not stopped, they are only transferred to another sphere, to be continued with intensified energy under spiritual conditions." With this thought, the thought that with the angels we may be serving God in heaven, after we have served Him in our own generation, I must leave you with this one caution—Do not forget that there remaineth a rest for the people of God. Do not confuse rest with stagnation. Bear away with you the thought of God as the greatest and most conscientious Worker; seek yourselves by active conscientious work to do His will. Remember the example of Christ's life, and that He gives us reason to believe that other higher duties await us by telling us of the faithful servants who were promoted to rule over cities, and then seek to show yourselves approved unto God, workmen that need not to be ashamed, and thus make your labour

A constant prayer;
A voice of aspiration after right;
A voice of effort yearning for its rest;
A voice of high hope conquering despair.

THE Rev. G. F. Saxby, vicar of Monks Kirby, speaking on Wednesday last in reference to the Bishop of Worcester, said that his lordship was an example to the present generation—in fact he might say to three generations, for he recently had the felicity of congratulating his lordship on his eighty-first birthday. Whenever he had occasion to write to him he invariably received an answer by return of post, and as invariably in his own handwriting; and if any document accompanied it, that also was in his lordship's own handwriting. He was, in fact, the best business man he had ever heard of. He spent most of his time in spring in going about his diocese, holding confirmations two or three times a week, and twice or thrice a day; and he would not accept any one's hospitality, but went to an hotel to have a quiet evening so that he might toss off a few dozens of letters. The Bishop of Worcester was, he thought, an example that might be followed with advantage by every one.

CANON HOWELL, of Wrexham, has been offered and has accepted the newly constituted archdeaconry of Powys, in St. Asaph diocese.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE,** or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW,** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary, **OBESITY IS CURED,** and will be sent, **gratis and post free,** on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 22, 1889.

THE REREDOS ON ITS TRIAL.

THE recent decision upon the preliminary question connected with the reredos in St. Paul's Cathedral, given in the Court of Queen's Bench, deserves grave attention, and ought to open the eyes of all who are not wilfully blind.

This ought to cause Englishmen of all religious persuasions, and having any patriotic impressions or sense of the worst dangers which ever beset liberty, to unlearn a good many false impressions and persuasions long current upon ecclesiastical affairs. Many, heedlessly taking the clergy for the Church, have forgotten that the laity are just as much the Church as these others. Not that the laity are officers of the Church as the clergy are. But they are equally with them members of that divinely appointed society. Then, again, if the clergy are officers they are so under the conditions of a twofold contract.

First, they are "your servants for Jesus' sake," and not "Lords over God's heritage." The bishops and clergy alike are only trustees to carry out certain well-defined objects in the letter and spirit of clearly ascertained laws. The Church, or *Ecclesia*, is the whole body of the faithful. And, accordingly, the Church was not made for these officers, but these officers for the Church. It is an inversion of relations to suppose otherwise, the inversion of making the means to an end the end itself. Some talk and write the nonsense of the absolute authority of a bishop, *ex vi officii*. They only are to be obeyed as officers, high or low, "who are lawfully called in the Church," and who faithfully fulfil the objects and ends of their high

calling. Then again, there is the second condition of a contract between Church and State superadded. If the officers are bound to the Church as a reformed National Church, having a divine author and known principles derived from Him, so are they bound to the State, as having signed standards of religion and undertaken to fulfil specified conditions under sanctions of reward or punishment. These officers have done all this with their eyes open. And, knowing that their alleged breach of a contract made to God and the Church and this realm of England is a most serious matter, must be prepared to give account of their stewardship in the premisses. If questions of doubt arise under the many complications possible, these dignitaries must know that it is ridiculous for them to attempt "to ride the high horse," and refuse explanation and satisfaction, or disclaim their amenableness to law. They are under the law, not over it. They are servants not masters. Their generously-conceded and freely-allowed "discretion" is meant to prevent the great scandal of "frivolous and vexatious suits," but not to promote the greater scandal of frivolous and vexatious prevention of legitimate inquiry and serious complaint by suit. To suppose the opposites is to establish an ascendency, either as of the Guelphs over the Ghibbelines, or *vice versâ*. The "veto" is not substantially or at all vetoed by insisting that the "reasons" for it must be reasonable and not unreasonable, logical and not sophistical, constitutional and not arbitrary, under the law not over it. And that the laity in this free country of England, when they claim decisions on vital religious questions, are not to be treated like so many "naughty schoolboys," and so "shut up," and sent about their business when applying for justice from a bishop. How such an escapade should have been exhibited at the close of this nineteenth century, and in the City of London, would seem incredible, did not the facts of the week before last stare us in the face, and the calm constitutional decisions of our ablest judges ring as with a trumpet blast the doom of clerical innovation, and of the episcopal absolutism so long backing it up. All honour to the brave and bright English heads and hearts from whom an insistance of their legal privileges, as subjects of Queen Victoria and members of a reformed Christian Church, has emanated, and eventuated, so far forth, in a complete justification of their right to a final and authoritative decision in connection with a vital question at issue. Amongst the lessons, the folly of courts solely episcopal in constitution, unless "in the first instance," has demonstrated itself. The whole affair is replete with instruction, taken from whatever point of view.

IT is stated that the Bishop of London has decided to appeal from the decision of the Queen's Bench Division, to the Court of Appeal.

THE CONFESSIONAL IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BY THE REV. MARSHALL C. VINCENT, M.A.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE DUBLIN CLERICAL ASSOCIATION, MAY 13TH, 1889.

THE Church of Rome recognises seven sacraments; they are: Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, Matrimony. We have certainly in Scripture allusions to six of these ordinances more or less distinct; but with regard to the seventh, "Penance," or the system of the "Confession," we have *not one* instance of its use or its institution by Christ or His Apostles. This complete silence upon the subject of this most important and vital ordinance is most remarkable and highly suggestive. Certain teachers tell us that the first germs of spiritual life are imparted to us in baptism, and that this life is nourished and sustained by the Eucharist, but more than that, that in the confessional our *daily sins are washed away by absolution, in the precious blood of Christ;* and yet we have not one word about it in Holy Scripture! But if Scripture is *silent* on the point, Roman and Ritualistic theologians *are not!* Let us hear what they have to say.

First let us open the Roman "Catechism of Perseverance" (Duffy's), page 213; *there* we find the following questions and answers:

Q. What is the Sacrament of Penance?—A. Penance is a Sacrament instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins committed after Baptism. There is no sin, how great soever that may not be forgiven by the Sacrament of Penance, when well received.

Q. (at p. 215), What is confession?—A. Confession is the accusation of our *sins to an authorised priest* for the purpose of obtaining absolution.

Q. (at p. 216) Is confession the *only* means established by Jesus Christ for the remission of sins?—A. Confession *is* the *only* means established by Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Our Lord does not point out any other; the Church knows of no other. Next, look at *the short Catechism* (published by Gill).

Q. What is confession?—A. Confession is a sorrowful declaration of our sins *made to a priest* in order to obtain forgiveness.

Q. What is absolution?—A. Absolution is the sentence of pardon, *given by the priest*, a minister of God, in the Sacrament of Penance.

So far we learn *four things* with regard to this *Sacrament of Penance.* (1) It was instituted by Christ for the remission of sins after baptism. (2) It is the *only means* established for the remission of sins after baptism. (3) The confession is made *to* an authorised *priest.* (4) The pardon or absolution is given *by the priest.* Let us now turn to an *Anglican Teacher.*

I will quote from a small but very popular book in England, "A Help to Repentance, intended chiefly for Young Persons," by the Rev. Vernon W. Hutton. (London: Longhurst, price 2d.) He begins well by urging the duty of repentance, sorrow for sin, and confession to God. "But," he goes on, "if your repentance is deep and earnest, you will probably feel that this confession is insufficient;" "you will wish to receive a more direct assurance from God that your sins are put away;" "the priests of the Church have

power to absolve you in the name of the Holy Trinity from your sins."

"Just as Holy Baptism gives remission of sins committed previously, *so* absolution gives remission of sins committed after baptism." "Seek therefore the application of Christ's cleansing blood to your soul in this His own appointed way. Go to one of His priests and confess to him your sins ; lay all before him, as you have laid them before God." At p. 24 we read, after the confession is over, "the priest will then pronounce over you the form of Absolution which you find in the Prayer Book in the order for the Visitation of the Sick." "You are *clean now*" (*sic*), *your sins are gone*, etc. Moreover, the penitent is warned "not to talk about what the priest has said ;" he is to be "very careful about this." This is peculiar. If the priest has given good advice and profitable instruction, what harm could it be to pass it on? If any one of us have had scruples and doubts removed before coming to the Holy Communion by "opening our grief," and receiving "counsel and comfort" from some "discreet and learned minister of God's word," why might we not try and comfort others "with the comfort wherewith we ourselves have been comforted of God?" But if certain questions have been asked (which I find in this book) of young children or married women, then one can quite easily understand that it would be considered wiser to warn the penitents "not to talk about what the priest has said to them."

It is very remarkable that in another little book called "Confession," published by G. J. Palmer, London (office of the *Church Times*), I find this note (p. 23): "I will add a little piece of advice, which is of some consequence. Never repeat to your companions your confessions, your sins, or what your confessor has said to you."

No one is likely to tell their "confession" or their "sins." No ; the point lies in the last paragraph. "Never repeat, to father, mother or husband, what your confessor has said to you."

This little book on "Confession" is edited by a committee of clergy,* they have brought out several manuals of a like character. Every Protestant clergyman should get and study this little book, the price is only one penny. I shall return to it again, but I must here quote two short sentences at page 13 : "To confess and to receive absolution is the appointed means by which a sinner can be again restored to the favour of God ;" and, further, "Whilst the priest is pronouncing the words of absolution, God, through Jesus Christ, cleanses the soul of the penitent Christian from all sin in the precious blood of His dear Son." I find the same teaching in a Roman manual called "Holy Childhood" (p. 118) speaking of when the priest pronounces the absolution, it says : "It is at this moment that the blood of Jesus really flows over you, and washes you white from every stain." These extracts are sufficient. We see plainly what these teachers mean by the Sacrament of Penance.

The system of the Confessional, as taught and practised by these Romans and Anglicans, then comes to this: (1.) It is according to these teachers, "the only or the appointed means whereby sins committed after baptism are remitted." (2.) It is "the application of Christ's cleansing blood to our souls in Christ's own appointed way" (says the *Anglican;* Mr. Vernon Hutton).

"At this moment the blood of Jesus really flows over you" (says the *Roman* Manual).

It is quite necessary for us, as Churchmen, to look into and examine this question of "the Confessional," for there is so much ignorance and apathy to be met with. Many have never had a Roman or Ritualistic Manual on Confession in their hands, and so know absolutely nothing about it, or what is really taught ; and if any one ventures to denounce the system, they are called "narrow-minded," "intolerant," etc.

As Churchmen we may and ought to tolerate different views. As brethren and ministers of the same church we meet in this room, and, I think, give a fair hearing to all sides—high, low, broad, or neutral. But I think that we must draw the line somewhere, and we must draw it for one thing at the confessional. As Christians, because it has no place in the Holy Scriptures ; as Churchmen, because it has no place in our Book of Common Prayer, and as citizens because it is degrading to humanity, and is a powerful weapon in the hands of an intolerant and insolent priesthood. This system of the confessional is a part of a great conspiracy for the exaltation of that priesthood, a part of that "spirit of Antichrist," the setting up of a great sacerdotal system where the Priest sits as God to judge men, to apply or not apply the precious Blood to souls as he chooses !

Is this language too strong? Hear what an English clergyman, the Rev. Dr. Linklater, vicar of Holy Trinity, Stroud Green, London, in one of the "Tracts for the People," published last year (Griffith and Farran), says, "Confession," p. 10 : "The priests are the organs of His Body, Christ in Heaven willeth not the death of the sinner, and to heal him touches the sinner on earth by means of the Priest, who is the touching part of His Body !" And in the "Penitent's Path" (edited by the Committee of Clergy), we read (p. 24), "Now that which Jesus did on earth for the bodies of His people by His touch, His word, His clothes, He does now by the mouth and hands of His ministers for the souls of His people." The priest then sits as God in the Temple of God, to heal by his mouth and hands and touch the souls of men ! I say, then, that this monstrous system of priestly imposture has no place in either Bible or Prayer Book. Let us now turn to the 20th chapter of St. John's Gospel and read those verses, which are supposed to settle the whole question :

"Jesus therefore said to them again, 'Peace be unto you, as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.' And when He had said this He breathed on them and and saith unto them : 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost ; whosesoever sins ye forgive they are forgiven unto them ; whosesoever sins ye retain they are retained.'"

With regard to this text, which is supposed to settle the whole question, I turn to the notes at the end of the Douay Bible (published by Gill in 1882), and I find under the head of "Confession" these words : "The obligation of Confession is gathered from the judiciary power of binding and loosing, forgiving and retaining sins, given to the pastors of Christ's Church." (Matt. xviii. 18, and John xx. 22, 23.) And in the little "Guide to Confession," by the Committee of Clergy, I find these words : "When you were younger you may have confessed your faults to your parents. Now you are old enough to know that many of these faults are also sins against God, and it is to the priest, that by God's appointment, you ought now to confess your sins. Do you know why? It is because Christ, when He was on earth, gave to His priests the power

* I have read that the committee consisted of three priests : the Rev. J. E. Vaux, the Rev. Dr. Littledale, and the late Rev. A. H. Mackonochie of St. Albans.

of forgiving men their sins. You remember how Jesus said to His Apostles, and through them to the priests of His Church, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,'" etc.

These Roman and Anglican writers, therefore, agree upon this point that Christ has given to the priests of His Church a certain mysterious supernatural power of forgiving men their sins. Let us now hear the words of that learned and distinguished prelate who for many years presided over this diocese—I mean the late Archbishop Whately—upon this point. I quote from his work, entitled "Two Essays on the Kingdom of Christ." He says that the Gospel or good tidings which the Apostles were authorised to proclaim being more especially tidings of remission of sins to all who would accept the invitation they might properly be said to "remit" or "retain," according as they admitted to baptism, the professedly penitent and believing hearer, and left out of the number of the subjects of Christ's kingdom those who opposed Him; and again, "this remission of sins proclaimed by the Apostles was conditional only, and dependent on a condition of things of which they, the Apostles themselves, had no infallible knowledge, that is, the real sincerity of the penitence and faith which the converts appeared and professed to have. But although this is the only sense in which the Apostles or any of their successors in the Christian ministry can be empowered to "forgive sins" as against God, that is, though they can only pronounce and proclaim His forgiveness of all those who come to Him through Christ, and assure each individual of his acceptance with God, supposing him to be one of those who "truly repent and unfeignedly believe," yet offences as against a community, may, it is plain be pardoned, or pardon for them withheld, by that community, or by those, its officers, who duly represent it."

It is clear from these words that Archbishop Whately did not hold the monstrous doctrine taught by the "Committee of Clergy" that "priests heal souls" by their "hands, mouth, and touch," nor did he agree with Dr. Linklater that he was one of the "touching organs" of Christ's body. No! he held that scriptural view of Absolution which our Prayer Book teaches, that God "pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent," and that all that the priests or ministers of the Church can do is to "pronounce" and "proclaim" God's forgiveness to all who come to Him through Christ, and that God will accept such if they are truly penitent. But in case some one may say "Archbishop Whately was a broad Churchman, of course he did not believe in confession." I will now proceed to quote another bishop and a decided high Churchman. Listen to his words: "Since there is no necessity declared in Scripture of confessing all our sins to a priest, no mention of Sacramental Penance and Confession, it must needs seem strange that a doctrine of which here is no commandment in Scripture, no direction for the manner of doing so difficult a work, no office or officer described to any such purpose, that a doctrine, I say, of which, in the fountain of salvation there is no spring, should yet become, in process of time, to be the condition of salvation; and yet for preaching, praying, baptizing, communicating, we have precept upon precept, and line upon line! We have in Scripture three epistles written to two bishops in which the episcopal office is abundantly described and excellent canons established, and the parts of their duties enumerated, and yet no care taken about the office of father confessor." *These are the words of the renowned Bishop Jeremy Taylor in his valuable and learned work* (too little read in these days), "A Dissuasive from Popery." At page 345 Jeremy Taylor says that he can "prove that the necessity of confessing our sins to a priest is not found in Scripture, but apparently the contrary;" and with regard to the text in St. John's xx, "whose sins ye remit," etc., he remarks:—

"The Council of Trent makes their new doctrine to rely upon these words of Christ. Yet all the canonists allow not that confession was instituted by Christ." He states that though they differ much as to particulars, yet all consent that "*from the words of Christ no necessity of confession to a priest can be concluded!*" Again (page 357), he says "Whatever kind of absolution it is the bishops or priests have power to use, it does its work intended *without any real changing of state in the penitent.* The priest alters nothing, he diminishes no man's right, he gives nothing to him but what he had before, he declares the will of God, he prays to God for pardon, and so he prays that God will give the sinner the grace of repentance. But he can no more give pardon than he can give repentance; *He that gives this gives that.*" This is certainly opposed to the view of Mr. Vernon Hutton (the Ritualist), who says to the penitent, "you are clean now;" and from that of the "Committee of Clergy" who teach that "Absolution cleanses the soul from all sin," and that "Absolution is like a second Baptism," this clearly points to a "change of state."

I will now turn to a living, eloquent, and learned bishop of our Church, the Most Rev. Dr. Reichel, Lord Bishop of Meath. With regard to "the Confessional," in Church history, his lordship in his eloquent (and I believe unanswerable) sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, June 10th, 1883, on "The History and Claims of the Confessional" (published by Longmans) shows plainly that the whole system was one of gradual growth. He says (at page 3), "In the earliest Church we find no trace of any confession of sin beyond that confession which every Christian has always felt it a duty and a privilege to make to God in secret, and the mutual confession of sins recommended by St. James." "There is no trace of any form of absolution, such as we use," he says, "in the most ancient Greek liturgies or in the Latin Canon of the Mass." With regard to the prayer in the visitation office, which immediately follows the absolution, the Bishop says, "This prayer, which is of high antiquity, is the real and only absolution from sins ever pronounced in the Latin Church for the first twelve centuries." In 1215 every Christian was ordered, it seems, to confess all his sins to his parish priest at least once a year. In 1268 the prayer of absolution was changed into the style at present used, "I absolve thee from all thy sins;" and it was furthermore declared that, unless this positive form was used, the absolution granted would not be effectual!

"Private confession" is nowhere prescribed in our Prayer Book. Only those who before communion "cannot quiet their own consciences" are exhorted to come and "open their grief." It does not say "secretly;" it does not say that the person is to "confess all their sins." "Confession" is not mentioned. It need not be private. There is no reason why two friends or a mother and daughter might not go together to a learned and discreet minister and both get comfort and counsel; there is no mention of secret or auricular confession. The penitent is to "open his grief" to the minister,

as the Bishop of Meath says, "in order that he may receive the benefit of absolution, not by the pronouncement of a certain form for which there is no provision, but by the ministry of God's Holy Word; in other words, that he may receive the assurance of the Divine forgiveness through the application to his personal case of the general promises of the Word of God made by one who is learned in the same, and qualified by his office to expound it with authority."

Is not this the true doctrine of Scripture and of our Church as to absolution? The pronouncing of a form of absolution does *not* "convey a pardon from God, which, without it, would not be granted." It does *not* change any man's state before God. The priest simply assures the penitent or the sick man of God's pardon if he "turns to Him with hearty repentance and true faith;" and he prays that God may "pardon and deliver him from all his sins, confirm and strengthen him in all goodness, and bring him to everlasting life." This is not the teaching of the Ritualists.

In "An Altar Book for Young Persons" (Masters, London), approved of by Canon T. T. Carter, of Clewer, I find this note in the Communion Service (p. 60), the Absolution: "Now humbly bow your head and pray that God may apply to your soul the absolution of His Priest," not that "God may pardon you," but "His Priest." It is the formula of absolution; that is the important matter in their eyes.

Is it not plain then from these "Manuals of Devotion" that the Ritualist and the Romanist have added a new Article to the Creed? "*I believe in one absolution for the remission of sins committed after baptism!*"

This is the teaching of Mr. Vernon Hutton in his "Help to Repentance"! "Just as holy baptism gives remission of sins committed previously, *so absolution* gives remission of sins committed after baptism." And again, in a Ritualistic tract, entitled "Thoughts before and after Confession,"* I read as follows:—"*Original sin is washed away in the regenerating waters of holy baptism; sin after baptism is cancelled by the holy ordinance of absolution*"! "This, then, is the answer to the sinner's cry: How can this intolerable burden of sin be removed? By absolution." "Confession must be made to God and to God alone, but in the manner God has appointed through His priests." "It is to God the penitent must confess, and it is man whom God has appointed to receive this confession, even His priests;" and in the little book on "Confession" (edited by the Committee of Clergy), I read on page 6, "Our Lord Jesus Christ invites us to confess to His priests all the great sins that we have committed," and (page 4) the child is taught, "You must tell the priest all the sins that you remember to have committed, *God absolutely requires this.*" These are downright falsehoods!

I defy anyone to find a single text in Holy Scripture which tells us that "*confession is to be made to God through His priests,*" or that *God has* "*appointed them to receive our confessions*"! But what makes these *shameless lies* of the Committee of Clergy worse, is that the book is written for children. *Where does Christ invite us to confess to a priest?* Where do we read that God "absolutely" requires us to tell a priest "all" our sins; not in the Bible, and *certainly not in the Prayer Book?* But not only have these modern heretics added a new article to the Creed, "*I believe in one absolution for the remission of sins after baptism;*" but they have altered the Holy Scriptures! According to Dr. Linklater, Mr. Vernon Hutton, and this precious "Committee of Clergy," 1 John i. 7-9, *ought* to read: "*If we confess all our sins to the priest, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and we shall be cleansed from all unrighteousness, and by his absolution the blood of Jesus Christ, God's son, shall cleanse us from all sin.*"

In a "Manual for the Children of the Church," published by the well-known Church Extension Association, the child is taught (at page 40) this hymn:—

Yes, I am going to God's Priest
To tell him all my sin,
And from this very hour I'll strive
A new life to begin.

When I confess with contrite heart
My sins unto the priest,
I do believe from all their guilt
That moment I am released.

This is one of the worst features of the revival of the Confessional. Grown men and women can think and act for themselves, but with children it is different, they are easily led. *Confirmation time* is the harvest of souls for the Ritualistic Father-Confessors. A searching form of "Examination of Conscience" is put into the children's hands on the Ten Commandments and "Seven Deadly Sins." The Priest sees each one alone. He works gradually upon their feelings, "My child tell me all," and so on, until by his sanctified importunity he gets the poor child to confess some sin never told before to human being, and then the battle is won. The poor little soul is in the power of its Ghostly Father, and as it grows older and older the chains of the hateful bondage become more and more firmly rivetted, until it is at last a complete slave of the Confessional.

And then it is at *Retreats* that the *clergy* are got hold of by the same process—self-examination, private interviews—the conductor is generally an adept at the business. He will cautiously recommend Confession. And every clergyman converted to the Confessional is looked upon as a great victory, as he is sure to influence others and bring them under the yoke of this Sacerdotal Supremacy! Bishop Reichel has well described the Confessional as a "Fearful engine of Spiritual Tyranny."

I have endeavoured to prove in this paper the identity of the Roman and Ritualistic teaching as to this system of the Confessional. They plainly agree that (1) "*Absolution is the only appointed means for remission of sins committed after baptism.*" (2) That "*Absolution is the application of the precious Blood of Christ to our souls.*" (3) That *Absolution changes our state*, "*You are clean now*" (Vernon Hutton), "*You are restored to God's favour*" (Committee of Clergy), and (4) "*God absolutely requires us to tell all our sins to the Priest* in confession" (Committee of Clergy).

You will not find one of these doctrines in our Prayer Book! Why? because they are doctrines of the Church of Rome, the doctrines of Manning and Newman, Walsh and Croke!

I hope that to-day these *four* points will be taken up. I hope that all who speak to-day will repudiate these false doctrines, which have no place either in Holy Scripture or the Book of Common Prayer. Habitual Confession is taught in these Ritualistic Manuals. The Committee of Clergy say to young persons, "It is well to go to Confession at *regular*

* London; Church Printing Co.

intervals." Mr. Vernon Hutton says, "Go *whenever you are preparing for Holy Communion.*" Dr. Pusey recommends "*frequent* confession." He says, "*Even advancing Christians have found frequent confession a help.*" "Souls which have used it have shone *more and more unto the perfect day.*" Where is all this to be found in the Prayer Book?

Then the questioning of Penitents in "the Confessional" is highly dangerous and objectionable, and has no place in the Prayer Book. The Committee of Clergy in their little Manual say to the child: "Listen attentively to any questions the Confessor may ask, and answer without any concealment." The Confessor "will ask you questions; you will answer openly," etc. Mr. Vernon Hutton says, "Bring the paper with you on which you have written down your sins. Say how often and what kind of sins you have committed, and as far as you can remember each act of sin!" "Be sure to confess *all;* it is a great sin to keep back anything" (Help to Repentance, pp. 21, 22). Putting the Bible on one side, I ask *where do we find the authority for all this* "Confessional" system *in our Prayer Book?* "Confess *all*," "tell the Priest *all* you have done," "confess whenever you are preparing for communion," *where do we find this in the Prayer Book?* And all this is put forth by those who are never tired of calling themselves "good Churchmen!" and speak of working parishes upon "decided Church lines!" They recommend "Frequent" and "Regular Confessions" of "all" our sins, although plainly not the teaching of the Prayer Book; is this a mark of "*good churchmanship?*" We shall, I suppose, be told to-day that frequent confession is a great means of "*growth in grace*" and a "*help to holiness.*" See the effects of the system upon a large body of English gentlemen. I mean the Society of the Holy Cross. At least 500 English clergymen belong to it, who *must use sacramental confession according to their rules* "at least once a year." Listen to Rule 5 (Standard of Daily Life) the brethren are recommended "*to keep a careful watch over the eyes, and not needlessly to look at the face or person of women!*" And so Dr. Pusey, in his "Advice to Confessors"* tells these holy men to be "specially wary" in the Confessional, and then he goes on, "you should avoid fixing your eyes upon the women you are actually confessing, as well as on those who are waiting around;" "make your general intercourse with women short and severe." "Be specially careful where your penitents' youth or attractions; the subjects you have to deal with; their great piety; or their malice; are *liable* to make any unwonted impression on your heart, *or on their own.* Do not be surprised at my including piety among the perils; it has more than once (!!) been a stumbling block to imprudent confessors who, beginning with spiritual esteem, have *insensibly slipped into earthly* and carnal attachments." "You are not to call a young woman 'my dear daughter.'" In dealing with women, confessors are admonished to "*watchfulness*" together with "a *guarded speech and downcast eyes*" to be "rather severe than affable." You must on no account permit them "to *kiss your hand*" nor "*watch them leaving the confessional.*" When visiting sick women the confessor is advised to "*avert his face* from the sick person, especially if she be a pious woman, towards whom it is more easy to feel affection." "How many good priests have been the victims of such affections" (page 108). *All this put forth by a Protestant Divine!* No wonder men do not like their wives or daughters to confess to these disciples of Dr. Pusey, who cannot look a woman *straight in the face like honest men!* And this is the Confessional which we are told is such a "*help to holiness*" and to *growth in spiritual life!* and yet these *holy confessors* seem actually to be unable to look at the *face* of a sick woman without experiencing improper emotions!

* London: Parker.

I must here quote a passage from a work written by one, who was once a priest of Rome, on "Celibacy" and the "Confessional." He says, "Not only are the priests of Rome deprived of the only remedy which God has given to help them to stand up, but they have, in the confessional, the greatest facility which can possibly be imagined for satisfying all the bad propensities of fallen human nature. In the confessional they know *who are strong and who are weak* among the females by whom they are surrounded. If they still retain the fallen nature of man, what a terrible hour for them! what superhuman efforts and strength would be required to come out a conqueror from that battle-field. For instance: take lawyers, merchants, farmers, etc., and preventing them from living with their lawful wives, surround them with ten or twenty or more attractive women and girls, such as are in convents and sisterhoods, who *speak to them, alone, of things which can pulverise a block of granite,* and how many of these farmers, lawyers, or merchants will go out of that battle-field without being mortally wounded?" "The confessional," he says, "is the corner-stone of the stupendous power of the priest, the *secret of their almost irresistible influence.* Let the people desert the confessional-box *to-day,* and *to-morrow* Romanism will crumble into the dust."

We know how this system is making way in the English Church. Societies, guilds, confraternities are set up in every Ritualistic parish, presided over by a "priest superior" who is also the "father-confessor." The members are given badges and medals blessed by this priest. They confess to him; you may see children of eight or ten years of age confessing to these priests in England. This system has, we fear, begun in our Church of Ireland. Shall we suffer it to come in without a protest? Shall we tolerate it in silence? Other nations and other churches have cast off this yoke, and are *advancing steadily along the line of civilisation and freedom.* Even in wretched priest-ridden Spain, the "home of the Inquisition," and Italy where for centuries a proud and insolent hierarchy have held unlimited sway over the souls and bodies of men, even in these dark lands we see unmistakeable signs of a mighty awakening. For the glorious day *will* come, *must* come! when the tyrranous rule of the priest shall be remembered simply as a hideous dream of the past, only to be shuddered at, and when the glorious sunshine of light and liberty and prosperity shall flood the land and gladden every heart. And shall we, English and Irish Protestants, who know the truth, go back to an iniquitous system which blighted our land and church before the Reformation, and kept our forefathers in slavish bondage and moral degradation? I answer, *never.* Let us boldly and plainly *expose* these errors, and *teach* the true doctrine in our pulpits, our Bible classes, meetings, and visits. As faithful pastors we must warn the flock.

In conclusion, I will quote the words of the Bishop of Meath in his sermon at Cambridge: "The Confessional is often spoken of as conducive to morality; the verdict of history is different. The *least moral* countries in Europe have been always those in which

it existed unquestioned; and the *least moral* periods in the history of these countries were those in which the laws of the land made it compulsory to attend it. With my last breath would I say to the Church of England and her wide dependencies: *Stand fast* in the liberty with which *Christ hath made you free.*"

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CLANDESTINE MARRIAGES.

SIR,—With all due deference to a "Registrar and Churchman," whose experience is no doubt much wider than my own, I am quite prepared to justify the contents of my article on this subject. The only point which was not quite definite, and therefore apparently inaccurate, was that of *fees*. The actual marriage fee before a registrar is as I stated five shillings, but there are two other notice fees of one shilling each. Add to this the fee for the "Lines," and you have 9s. 7d., when both parties reside in the same district. The Church fee of 8s. 6d. does not include the "Lines," which bring it up to 10s. 7d. If banns are published in *two* churches there is the extra shilling for publication, and 2s. 7d. more for certificate of doing so, making 14s. 2d., as against 11s. 7d. at the registry office. Thus, unless some of these fees are remitted, the registry office is decidedly the cheaper of the two. That they are often remitted is a well-known fact, as also that in some churches a lower fee is asked; but with regard to the case quoted of a "non-religious" person, I beg to remind "Registrar and Churchman" that if the clergyman knew that the intending bridegroom was either unbaptized or an unbeliever, he would have been legally as well as morally right in refusing to marry him. Even were the Church fees cheaper, it would not therefore countenance such an act of sacrilege as that of which your correspondent speaks. The clergy are not bound to marry those who are not Christians, and I think that "Registrar and Churchman" will find that, where people do go to church because it is cheaper, they are not, with very rare exceptions, non-religious, but Nonconformists. If the PULPIT has treated the subject with "the usual prejudice and the usual lack of knowledge one finds in clerical journals," its view nevertheless coincides with that of the Bishop of London, who says: "The increase of marriages in registrar's offices instead of in churches is due, to a large extent, to the fact that marriages in church are more costly than before a registrar. This in my opinion is not right. Persons who wish to be married in church ought not to be made to pay more than they would be called on to pay if married before a registrar; and temptation ought not to be put in their way to marry without getting the blessing of the Church on their union. I therefore propose to fix the Church fee by Act of Parliament, such fee not to be dearer than that for marriage before a registrar which is fixed by Act of Parliament." In the matter of "comparative publicity of the two methods of publication," the article opened with an admission that the residence for fifteen days in a parish was often a pretence. People who, for whatever reason, do not desire publicity, but yet choose banns in preference to licence, can evade the *spirit* of the law very easily. It is to do away with this pretence that the proposed bill is framed. But even this gives some trouble. "A room hired for the purpose, a visit to the parish clerk," etc., is a more complicated proceeding than the mere entry at the registry office. No questions other than those prescribed are likely to be asked here any more than by the clerk; but, in spite of the "open exhibition for twenty-one days to every person entering the office," not one out of ten who so enter troubles himself to inspect the names, whereas every person who has ears to hear *must* hear them, *wearily* or not, when published in church. Of course in a town there is less likelihood of a stray name being noticed than in a small country place, where being "asked in church" is a comparatively rare occurrence. Yet even in a town a hearing by a number of auditors is secured, whilst the chance of inspection at the registry office by an acquaintance of parties whose home is at a distance is very remote indeed. I am quite aware that persons can only be married in the registry office of the district in which they reside; but I know equally well that many places are situated at a distance of six or eight miles from the registry office of their respective districts. As the article only dealt with marriages after banns and not with those by licence, the undeniable secrecy of the latter method is beside the question. If your correspondent could find anything therein which could be construed into an advocacy of people "who are neither church folk nor believers," coming to be married at church, I think most of your readers would be as surprised as I should be myself. Written in a Church newspaper, the obvious inference, even if not proved by the contents, would be that it referred principally, if not absolutely, to professing church people. I am therefore not concerned to answer "Registrar and Churchman's" questions as to those who opine that marriage in itself is not a religious act at all, whether they may be called religious or non-religious persons. Nor did I touch, as he does, upon the doctrinal aspect of holy matrimony. If I had done so, I certainly should never have suggested that "outwardly happy marriages as the result of marriage may be considered as implying that God's blessing has rested upon it," was to be taken as an invariable rule, any more than that unhappy marriages necessarily indicated the absence or withdrawal of the same. I am content with Bishop Harold Browne's statement that "though marriage may be called a sacrament, and anciently was so called, it comes not under our definition of a sacrament of the Gospel." Of the marriage *blessing*, let the XXV. Article of religion suffice, which, though referring to the greater sacraments primarily, is equally true of the lesser ones. "In such only as worthily receive the same, have they a wholesome effect or operation?" Lastly, your correspondent's caution as to making a pretence of marrying over again is needless, as no clergyman would think of tampering with the "legal ratification of such conjoining which secures to the parties married the sanction and protection of the law of the land." This, he tells us, constitutes marriage. So it does before *man*, but not before God; and it is with the religious vow, not the civil contract, that the clergyman is concerned. So long as he does not enter the names in the register of his church when they have already been entered elsewhere, he is perfectly within his legal rights in reading the marriage service, whensoever it may be approved by the ordinary.

YOUR CONTRIBUTOR.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—In some recent issues of your paper reference has been made to the above subject in a manner which leaves the impression that it is not correctly apprehended, because an attempt has been made to ground upon it a doctrine which it cannot at all sustain.

From the infancy of the Christian Church until the present time, the doctrine has prevailed that the punishment of the damned in hell will be for ever; but lately an attempt has been made to show that it will be only for a limited period, while they undergo a process of correction which will fit them for the abode of the saints in light, and that this must take place because God is a Father to His intelligent creatures. This innovation in Christian doctrine looks very like disguised popery. What is it but purgatory under another name? It is therefore worth while, with your permission, to inquire what principle underlies God's Fatherhood which includes this notion. There is no more fruitful source of error in theology than *partial* views of the Deity. It was this which Dr. Young sought to remedy, when he wrote in his "Night Thoughts" that a God *all mercy* is a God *unjust*. Some men seem to think that He is "such an one as themselves" and their idea of paternity partakes too much of the human element to be correct when applied to Him. It is an absurd way of finding out His moral perfections, by reasoning from the feelings of His sinful creatures. We know nothing of Him properly but what He has been pleased to reveal, and while we acknowledge that He is the "Father of His intelligent creatures," we do so under the limitation that He is also at the *same* time the Sovereign Lord of the universe, infinitely just, and that He will be our righteous Judge. As a Father, therefore, He cannot do anything that would *militate* against any of His other attributes or qualities. His actions as a Father will be in *harmony* with all these. No *special* argument can therefore be grounded upon His Fatherhood which can override or set aside considerations drawn from His other attributes. There is really nothing in the idea of paternity which, by *itself*, lends countenance to this doctrine, so that if it be true, it must be founded on something else. But *where* is the truth of it? No amount of critical ingenuity or sophistical reasoning can get rid of the fact that two equal portions of duration are pointed out in "these shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life." Whether the record in St. Luke xvi. 19-31 be a real story or a parable, it does not alter the fact that between the righteous and the wicked a "great gulf is fixed," which is impassable to those on both sides. And when the foolish virgins came knocking for admittance, the door was not opened, but they were met with the response "*I know you not.*" The redeemed serve God "*day and night*" in His temple, and *they* have no rest "*day nor night*, the smoke of whose torment ascendeth up for ever and ever." Εἰς αἰῶνα δὲ αἰώνων αὐτὸν ἀναβαίνειν λέγεται, ἵνα μάθωμεν ἀτελεύτητον εἶναι τὴν κόλασιν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν τῶν δικαίων τρυφὴν αἰώνιον (*Andreas Cæsar ad locum*). But why multiply arguments in refutation of a doctrine which the unsophisticated reason of men has been unable to find in the Bible, even from before the time that Irenæus wrote "*quibuscumque enim dixerit Dominus, Discedite a me maledicti in ignem perpetuum, isti erunt semper damnati;*" and the clergyman who has been honoured with the orders of the Church of England ought to *square* his conscience with her teaching before attempting to propound it. In the symbol of her faith, called the Athanasian Creed, she tells him that "they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire"; and she forbids him to approach God with what he believes a lie on his lips when he prays "from thy wrath and from *everlasting* damnation, Good Lord, deliver us;" also at that solemn time when the earthly remains of mortal humanity are being consigned to their last resting-place in the silent tomb, she asks him not to mock the Deity by praying that "He would not deliver him into the bitter pains of *eternal* death," when he believes that there is no eternal death at all. Such is the awful inconsistency in which men place themselves, who try to teach a doctrine which has no existence but in the figments of their own imagination.

R. DONALDSON.

Fintona, 11th June, 1889.

WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?

SIR,—Scripture says that if the watchman gives warning, he is innocent; if not, that all the blame falls on him.

1. I will then give warning. I only see one of the English extreme papers; but I believe it is the most extreme, so I watch its movements, and give warning.

2. In the number for this week we have a leading article to show how the English Prayer Book alone speaks so that the people may understand. It *was* so once, but now that is changed in Ritualistic churches. It is so, not only in England, but also now it is creeping into our few Irish extreme ones in Dublin. The service is rattled over at an enormous rate. The answer to one commandment is rendered inaudible by the clergyman rushing into the next. The ascription at the end of the sermon is a perfect farce, the main thing being the preacher's whisking round towards the altar. It is often said that the Ritualistic movement led to devotion in the service. So it may at first, but now that is all gone. The service is literally gabbled through in the most shameful manner, as if the clergyman was hurrying off to some more agreeable employment.

3. In the number of this paper for this week I read that the *Gloria in excelsis* should be read whilst all all kneel. I see this is sanctioned by the English Prayer Book, but in our revised Book we are told to stand. This is set at nought by our Ritualists, who continue on their knees. But no laws will bind some.

4. There is another remarkable utterance in this week's number of same paper. "Transubstantiation is really given up now by the Roman Catholic theologians." As Trent asserts it, as do all their popular works and catechisms, this is a groundless assertion. What the writer is driving at is that our articles, etc., do not condemn a change of substance, and corporal presence to be adored. But this end cannot be attained till the 4th Article is repealed, which says virtually that our Lord's Body is confined, except as to effects, to one place.

5. In our Irish Church paper, we have this week a quotation from an eulogium of Canon Scott-Holland, on the Bishop of Lincoln, which contains much matter for thought and criticism. He says: "I think it

is important for outsiders to understand the nature of Bishop King's loyalty to the Church of England. There are those of us, who, though profoundly convinced that God has planted them in our Church for good, yet have sympathies and aspirations, which would find a wider freedom of growth in another communion. There are those, too, who, though perfectly loyal themselves, do indirectly influence others in ways that are more or less disturbing and perilous. But with the Bishop of Lincoln we are concerned with one whose loyalty would satisfy, etc. This loyalty is a part of himself; it is inherent, ingrained, absolute, spontaneous. He is compact with loyalty. With him it is no rule or discipline; it is an instinct and passion. No one whom he ever influenced could have mistaken it, or could doubt that the Bishop's whole heart was loyal. "His loyalty is part of himself," it says; "it is no rule or discipline, it is an instinct and passion. He is compact with loyalty." What all this means it is hard to say; but it *seems* to mean that his loyalty is for some ideal of his own, for something that is part of himself, and that it does not extend to anything but which suits his own conceptions of what doctrines and ritual *ought to be*. However, we shall be able to judge better when we see the outcome of the present lawsuit. We have no faith in those "whose sympathies and aspirations seek a wider freedom of thought in another communion." We have no faith in those teachers who, posing "as perfectly loyal themselves, do indirectly influence others in ways that are more or less disturbing and perilous." We have seen, too, much of this in teachers and taught, and it sooner or later leads them to that other communion for which their sympathies and aspirations are yearning. The effect of the present trial will be that light will be thrown on the character of many of those who are fascinated by another communion; other than that in which God has planted them.

6. What is a Spiritual Body is now a common question? As to our Lord's Body, this is answered by the 4th Article; as to other Resurrection bodies, it is plain that they are also bound by rules as His was, for the tombs had to be opened for them to pass through. People confound two things—God's miraculous power over bodies, this is one thing; the other is the miraculous power conferred on bodies themselves by the resurrection. Another thing is lost sight of. Miraculous powers of passing through walls, etc., if given to resurrection bodies, has nothing to do with ubiquity, which St. Augustine says would make a body no real body at all. It is pretended that what the 28th Article condemns is not transubstantiation, but another doctine, that our Lord's material Body comes with its own accidents. But that is not the fact, what the Article condemns is that it comes at all corporally. That it should do so, both the 4th Article and the Black Rubric say are impossible.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

THE Bishop of Lichfield completed his sixty-third year on Tuesday last.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Addenbrooke, Rev. J. J., B.A., Vicar of Whixall, Salop.
Alderson, Rev. E. A., M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Second Class; Chaplain to the Forces, First Class.
Barrett, Rev. Canon, Vicar of St. Peter's-in-Eastgate-with-St. Margaret's, Lincoln; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Lincolnshire.
Blood, Rev. Alban Francis, Senior Curate of St. Mary's, Glasgow, and Curate-in-Charge of St. George's, Maryhill; Incumbent of Trinity Church, Kilmarnock.
Bolton, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. Sithney, Cornwall.
Browne, Rev. John James, M.A., Rector of Little Tey, Essex.
Bryans, Rev. E. de V., M.A., Vicar of Abbotts Bromley, Staffs.
Carden, Rev. A. V. W., M.A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Hastings.
Chalmers, Rev. Canon W., B.D., Incumbent of St. Paul's, Geelong; Incumbent of St. Andrew's, Brighton, Diocese of Melbourne.
Denniss, Rev. Augustus Brooke Warden, M.A., Rector of Chignal St. James, Essex.
Drew, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of Wapley-with-Codrington, Gloucestershire.
Feilden, Rev. John R., Vicar of Honingham-with-East Tuddenham, and Rural Dean; Honorary Canon of Norwich Cathedral.
Frost, Rev. C. C., Curate-in-Charge of St. Paul's, Farington, Preston; Rector of St. George's, Oldham-road, Manchester.
Gough, Rev. Thomas, Public Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.
Griffiths, Rev. C. E. O., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Cuthbert's, Gateshead; Vicar of Forest and Frith, Darlington.
Hall, Rev. W. E., L.Th., Incumbent of St. Saviour's, Bridge of Allan; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Andrews.
Hamilton, Rev. R. H., M.A., Rector of Astley, Worcestershire.
Hatton, Rev. James Ellerton, Licensed Public Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.
Heaton, Rev. Edward Hugh, M.A., Licensed to officiate in the Diocese of St. Asaph.
Hiron, Rev. S. F., LL.D., D.C.L., Rector of Whatlington, Sussex.
Holmes, Rev. John G., Vicar of St. Philip's, Sydenham; Dean of Grahamstown.
Hopwood, Rev. Frank E., Rector of Bury; Acting Chaplain to the Bury and Heywood Battalion of Volunteers.
Hunt, Rev. D. Cooper, Sole Charge of Christ Church, Guildford.
Lawrence, Rev. C. D., Rector of Bermondsey and Rural Dean of Southwark; Rector of Lowestoft.
Lloyd, Rev. John, M.A., late Rector of Penboyr, Carmarthenshire; Vicar of St. Peter's, Carmarthen.
Loughnan, Rev. J. E., Vicar of St. James's, Bradford; Rector of Walton, near Bridgewater.
Lucas, Rev H. H., M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Battersea; Rector of Filby, Norfolk.
Marle, Rev. W., B.A., the Missions to Seamen Chaplain, Plymouth; Perpetual Curate of Sourton, Devon.
Meddings, Rev. Richard, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of the Parish Church, Louth; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Great Grimsby.
Owen, Rev. Edward Tudor, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of St. Asaph.
Rhys, Rev. John Lewis, B.A., Vicar of St. Keverne, Cornwall.
Richardson, Rev. W. M., Vicar of Wolvercote, Oxford; Vicar of Ponteland, Northumberland.
Robinson, Rev. George, B.A., Vicar of Ellerton, Yorkshire.
Simmonds, Rev. A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Chatham; Vicar of St. Mark's, Reigate.
Talbot, Rev. J. W., Curate of St. Luke's, Sheffield; Vicar of Barmby-on-the-Marsh, Yorkshire.
Wallace, Rev. Walter E., M.A., Head Master of St. James's College, Southleigh; Chaplain to St. Paul's College, Stony Stratford.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Eaton, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Rector of West Kirby, and for upwards of forty years Canon Residentiary of Chester Cathedral, at the Rectory, West Kirby, on the 16th inst. (Trinity Sunday), in his 84th year.
Prescott, Rev. Thomas, for twenty-seven years Vicar of the parish, at Caddington Vicarage, Luton, on the 14th inst., aged 71.

The Church of England Pulpit.

PENTECOST.

By the Rev. Canon RAWSTORNE, M.A., Hon. Canon of Manchester Cathedral, late Vicar of Penwortham.

Sermon Preached in Manchester Cathedral, on Whit-Sunday, June 9th, 1889.

"Ἦσαν ἅπαντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.
Ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.
Ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα."
"They were all with one accord in one place."
"And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost."
"I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh."—Acts ii. 1, 4, 17.

THERE are two different pictures drawn of that great event of the day of Pentecost, which we are celebrating to-day. Let us begin by tracing these two pictures mentally, and then, after a few moments' consideration, let us decide, each for himself, which is the correcter representation of that which really took place.

In the first we see a little band of venerable men, twelve in number, the apostles and rulers of the new-born Church. On them, assembled in solemn conclave, apart from the other believers, descends the Spirit, like a rushing, mighty wind; and over each head sits the appearance of a flame, the apparent object of which is to distinguish them, and set them apart from their brethren, as the sole first possessors of the great gift of God, as the necessary *media*, through whom alone that gift could afterwards be communicated to the others, and to future Christians, even to the end of time.

That is one picture of the event.

And here is a second. In addition to these twelve, a congregation, consisting of those 120, who met a few days before in the well-known upper chamber, in which some fifty days before the Lord had taken leave of his disciples, and broken bread with them for the last time—120, or perhaps a few more, for, in those days, the Church could muster on an occasion as many as 500 at a time. But, however many they are, there are amongst them all ages, both sexes, and different ranks of life. There are sons and daughters, young men and old men, slaves as well as free men—all these present when the house is shaken, and the rushing, mighty wind is heard. And over the head of every one of them appears the flame, which, like that of Moses fifteen centuries before, lights without consuming. Men and women, young and old, slave and free, the officials and the people—without exception or distinction, the fire of God, the power of the spirit, has descended on them all.

There are the two pictures. Which of them is the true one?

I think that no one who reads the narrative attentively, either in the English or in the Greek, with a mind unencumbered by prejudice or tradition, can doubt that the second picture is the true one. As *all* the 120 were present at the election of the new Apostle in Judas' place, so *all* with one accord (ἅπαντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν) were present on the day of Pentecost, and on each one of these the Spirit sate; and so *all* (ἅπαντες) were filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.

This second picture was precisely that painted in vision by the prophet Joel, and which Simon Peter said that he saw actually realised before his eyes. "*This*," said he, pointing to the scene before him, "*This* is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days, said God, I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams, and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy." No one can help seeing that every detail of the second picture is to be found in the Apostle's speech, and that the scene may be taken to be that which was then present to his eyes. There they all were—the sons and the daughters—the young men and the old ones—the male slaves and the female slaves—the fire of God resting on every head, and the word of God proceeding from every mouth.

Thus it was not merely the Spirit descending upon officials to qualify them to rule, upon teachers to enable them to teach, but upon every member of Christ's great body, qualifying each for active duties, so that every member of the same in his vocation and ministry might truly and godly serve their Master, Christ. The event of Pentecost was, in fact, an ordination, on the most splendid scale, and with the most enduring effects—an ordination of every single Christian then present, and of every single Christian to the end of time, to be one of that royal priesthood which is qualified (as the same St. Peter said in later years, not forgetful of Pentecost) to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable unto God through Jesus Christ, to show forth the praises of Him who had called them out of darkness into His marvellous light. In a word, it was the descent of the Holy Spirit, not on the Apostles only, but on the Church at large, on the whole assembly of the faithful. By that Spirit, the *whole body* of the Church began then to be governed and sanctified. At that time the ministration of the Spirit was given to *every man* to profit withal—to make his gift profitable, beneficial to his fellow-Christians, and to the world.

And never, in the first age of fresh and pure Christianity, was it forgotten that the Holy Spirit is the heritage, not only of the Apostle, but of the disciple; not only of the teacher, but of the taught. Nor was there any function of the Church so apparently sacerdotal that the whole body of the Church (or what we now call the laity) did not take part in it. If there were an officer or minister of the Church to be appointed, from the lowest to the highest grade, from deacon to apostle, the election was made in the midst of the disciples, and by them. Whether the process was by lot or by ballot is not clear; but the κλήροι or ψήφοι used evidently belonged to them all. Or, when discipline had to be exercised, and the doer of a grievous sin had to be excluded or excommunicated, not for his destruction but for his own soul's good (1 Cor. v., 2 Cor. ii.), all took part in the trial, so that the verdict given and the sentence passed were those of the majority (ἡ ἐπιτιμία ἡ ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων); and the forgiveness or absolution of the offender on repentance was also the work of all. And even when a question of doctrine was at issue, like that one about the obligation of the ceremonial law, which Paul saw was vital, that question was not reserved for experts nor for officials; but the whole Church, as well as the Apostles and elders, was admitted to the deliberation, without any closing of doors, or exclusion of the reporters; and the decision at last arrived at ran in the name of all. And public teaching and public officiating continued free—at least to the male sex—"all might prophesy, one by one, so that all might learn and all be comforted" (1 Tim. ii. 8), and "the men (τοὺς ἄνδρας) might pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and disputing."

2. Let us next consider the practical effects, which this great gift, so freely given and so widely spread, exerted on the life of the Christians in those early days. We may put out of sight for the moment those miraculous, or at least marvellous gifts, which God was in those days pleased to bestow upon His Church, but which we no longer possess. Let us think only of the effect which this gift of the Spirit produced on those offices, administrations, activities, which we still possess, and in which we can imitate the Christians of the first age.

It made them all without exception active Christians, diligently employed in spiritual or charitable duties. Let me quote a few examples.

In Acts vi. 8 we read of seven officials appointed to serve at tables, to perform such secular work as the Apostles found interfered too much with their own spiritual functions. This was, I suppose, the first attempt at organising charity; and what was done was the establishment of an office, in which the seven acted partly as relieving officers, and partly as book-keepers of the charitable funds of he congregation. Nothing could be more prosaic than such a function. But these seven men, even before their appointment, were not only men of honest report, as their official duties of handling money specially required they should be, but full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom; and the more able and eloquent among them, such as Stephen and Philip, devoted their leisure time to the preaching of the word. These secular officials supplied the Church with her first martyr. It was one of these, who, without any apparent authority, except that of the Spirit within him, took the first step in giving the Gospel to the world outside of Judaism, by calling in those Samaritans in whom Jesus in His lifetime had taken such a special interest, and whose fields He had pronounced to be white already to harvest. It was one of these who brought to Christ the first of those, whom some of the Missionary Societies are pleased to call God's images in ebony, the first black man, and him excluded for other reasons from the congregation of the Lord. The Deacon's authority for taking this step is variously stated as the voice of the Lord's angel or the voice of the Spirit; certainly it came to him not from without, but from within. Let no one here think that the prosaic nature of his own office employments condemns him to be a mere quill-driver, and leaves no room in his heart for higher thoughts, or in his life for nobler employments. Let no man think that he has not a right, nor a call, to exercise with perfect freedom, whatever spiritual gift God has been pleased to give him.

Let me quote another example.

There are no two people who occupy a larger space in the life and adventures of St. Paul than Aquila and Priscilla, a Jew and Jewess, man and wife, by trade master tent-makers, who employed hands under them, and once had the good fortune to engage, in the course of trade, that wonderful journeyman, Saul of Tarsus. Outwardly, these two belonged to the class which is so graphically described by St. James, who was recognised as a sort of bishop by the greater part of them, the class who used to say to each other, "Go to now, to-day or to-morrow we will go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy, and sell, and get gain." They were true cosmopolites, as the Jews are now, and as they had begun to be even then, long before their country was taken from them, and their city destroyed. We find them in Pontus, where they originated, at Ephesus, at Corinth, and at Rome. Wherever they went they followed their trade, manufactured, bought, and sold. Thus they belonged to a class more thoroughly saturated with the commercial spirit than any other that was ever known. What their own personal mode of conducting business was we have no information; only, we may judge, that to meet the great cost of their constant journeying, their profits must have been large.

Here then were two people, as thoroughly com-

mercial as any one in Manchester, employing their lives in manufacturing, buying, and selling—a lay man and a lay woman—yet the Holy Ghost that was in them had taken out of them the desire of sordid gain, had made them true companions of Paul in his persecutions, and sharers of all his dangers, so that he calls them his helpers in Christ Jesus, who for his sake had laid down their own necks, and had placed all the churches of the Gentiles under obligations to them. It was these two who met with Apollos, a young man eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, but not yet fully instructed in the Gospel, and explained to him the way of God more perfectly. Wherever they went on their commercial journeys they assembled for worship such Christians as they could find. Of three congregations that were known to St. Paul as existing in Rome at the time when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans, one met in their house; and, remarkably, it is the only one to which St. Paul gives the name Church (ἐκκλησία), the only case in which that word is named in the whole of the Epistle to the Romans. In that debated question—Who was the founder of the Church of Rome? much might be said in favour of the claim of Aquila and Priscilla. Certainly the first Church at Rome ever heard of in history held its meetings in their house.

And, if you examine carefully that 16th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, out of which my last quotation came, you will be struck at the number of people, both male and female, in that great city, who were known to St. Paul, though he had never as yet been there, as working in the Lord.

The fact was that all the Christians, with hardly an exception, worked in the Lord.

This all was the effect of Pentecost. This all worked that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He would. It produced a life of God, pervading the whole Church, acting in every member, evoking love, faith, fervour, lively, vigorous, spiritual effort—conferring gifts first, and then stirring up men's wills to make the fullest use of their gifts. It set one to work crossing the seas after the heathen, another looking up the lost sheep at home, one preaching, another teaching, another giving, but all doing something.

And this life of God, then first conferred and bestowed, not on officials merely, but on every member, spread and spread again, produced and reproduced itself, breathed invisibly through the air, like a salutary infection, carrying health and life, instead of plague and death. The spirit passed, as our Lord said it should, like the wind, bearing everywhere what Paul called the sweet scent of the knowledge of Christ. The sound went into all lands, and the words unto the ends of the world.

It is a difficult point—indeed, an impossible point in Church history, to make out when, and by what apostle or missionary, this or that conspicuous Church was founded. We were just noting this fact in the case of the Church of Rome, of which no one knows who its founder was, though we have ventured to say a word to-day in favour of Aquila and Priscilla. The real way of accounting for that difficulty is a very simple one; those churches were never founded at all: they grew. Christians came to the great centres of trade, on their own avocations, chiefly Jew traders on commercial journeys; they found each other out; formed congregations; taught, and worshipped, and broke bread; and thus Christ's name and doctrine spread abroad by an intrinsic force, residing alike in every Christian. And the word will begin to spread again far faster than it has done for many, many centuries, whenever the truth becomes recognised again, that, the Pentecostal fire has fallen upon all, so that, as Tertullian says, the Church exists complete wherever two or three members of it are met, *saltem laici*, though only laymen. When the Church regains the consciousness, that every one of its members is a priest, and may exercise sacerdotal functions, when occasion calls for them, then the Church will go complete wherever Christians go, able to perform all its functions, able to propagate itself; and it will be smitten with the curse of barrenness no more.

The conclusion should be a contrast between the general life and activity of the Church in its earliest days, and our own backwardness. Each should ask himself, What am I doing in the work of God? In what thing dearly loved by Christ, and pointed out to me by Him, am I warmly interested and diligently engaged?

The work of Christ is to feed the hungry, and to help with charity and wisdom all that are physically distressed. His work is still more emphatically to remove, or (if that cannot be) to console the mental evils and sorrows, which are far more difficult to bear and also to cure, to bring good tidings to the poor, to heal the broken-hearted, to proclaim, release to prisoners, and new sight to the blind, to send the broken away relieved; in a word, to minister new hope and new life to those whose evils lie deeper than in the bodily frame.

Opportunities are all around us; and the event of to-day assures us that there is also power in us all. To sons and daughters, to old and young, to servants and to handmaidens, the Spirit is come. Let each obey the call which he has received, and do the work for which he has been enabled.

THE Bishop of St. Asaph commenced his confirmations on the 27th ult. at St. Asaph, and he has already confirmed more than 1,500 catechumens. His lordship intends taking up his residence at the Rectory, Llanymynech, near Oswestry, from June 28th to July 26th. The rector of Llanymynech has most kindly placed his house at the disposal of the Bishop in order that his lordship may have an opportunity of becoming personally acquainted with the Montgomeryshire portion of his diocese.

THE WISDOM THAT IS FROM ABOVE.

By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., Master of University College, Durham.

Sermon Preached in Durham Cathedral on Whit Sunday, June 9th, 1889.

"But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without variance, without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace for them that make peace."—St. James, iii. 17, 18.

AT the beginning of his epistle St. James exhorts those of his readers who feel their lack of wisdom to pray for it. Wisdom is one of those good and perfect gifts from above which come down from the Father of lights, Who giveth to all liberally and upbraideth not. In the verses before us he states in a few clear, pregnant words, what the characteristics of this heavenly gift of wisdom are. In both passages he probably had in his mind, and perhaps wished to suggest to his readers, well-known utterances on the same subject in the Books of Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, and Wisdom.

In the Book of Proverbs we read: "My son, if you cry afrer discernment, and lift up thy voice for understanding; if thou seek her as silver, and search for her as for hid treasures, then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God. For the Lord giveth wisdom; out of His mouth cometh knowledge and understanding" (ii. 3-6). Again in the magnificent "Praise of Wisdom," in the 24th chapter of Ecclesiasticus, wisdom is made to tell her own glories thus: "I came forth from the mouth of the most High, and covered the earth like a cloud. Then the Creator of all things gave me a commandment, and He that created me caused my tabernacle to rest, and said, Let thy dwelling be in Jacob, and thine inheritance in Israel." And in the Book of Wisdom Solomon is made to say of her: "She is the breath of the power of God, and a pure emanation from the glory of the Almighty: therefore doth no defiled thing fall into her. For she is the effulgence of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of His goodnes." (22, 25).

Three thoughts are conspicuous in the passages. Wisdom originates with God. It is consequently pure and glorious. God bestows it on His people. These thoughts reappear in St. James, and to them he adds a fourth, which scarcely appears in the earlier writers. Wisdom is "peaceable, gentle, easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits." In Proverbs we do indeed read that "all her paths are peace" (iii. 17); but the thought is not followed up. It does not seem to occur to the son of Sirach; and not one of the twenty-one epithets which the writer of the Book of Wisdom piles up in praise of this heavenly gift (vii. 22, 23) touches upon its peaceable and placable nature. It was left to the Gospel to teach, both by the example of Christ and by the words of His Apostles, how inevitably the Divine wisdom produces, in those who possess it, gentleness, self-repression, and peace.

"The wisdom that is from above is *first* pure, *then* peaceable." The "first," and the "then" may be seriously misunderstood. St. James does *not* mean that the heavenly wisdom cannot be peaceable until all its surroundings have been made pure from whatever would oppose or contradict it. He does *not* mean that the wise Christian will first free himself from the society of all whom he believes to be in error, and then, but not till then, will be peaceable and gentle; that is, that wisdom will denounce what seems to contradict it wherever she meets it, but will become easy to be intreated as soon as contradiction has ceased.

This interpretation does violence to the context, and makes St. James teach the very opposite of what the whole paragraph says plainly enough. It tries to enlist him on the side of partisanship and persecution at the very moment when he is pleading most earnestly against them. He is stating a logical order, and not a chronological one, when he declares that true wisdom is "*first* pure, *then* peaceable." In its inmost nature it is pure; among its various manifestations are the beneficent qualities which follow the "then." If there were no one to be gentle to, no one coming to intreat, no one needing mercy, the wisdom from above would still be pure; therefore this characteristic comes first.

But what does this purity mean? Certainly it must not be understood in the limited signification of chastity. The word "sensual," applied in the preceding verses to the wisdom from below, does not mean unchaste, but living wholly in the world of sense; and the purity of the heavenly wisdom does not consist merely in victory over temptations of the flesh, but in freedom from worldly and low motives. Its aim is that truth should prevail; and it condescends to no ignoble arts in prosecuting this aim. Contradiction does not ruffle it, and hostility does not provoke it to retaliate, because its motives are thoroughly disinterested and pure. Thus its peaceable and placable qualities flow out of it purity. It is because the man who is inspired with it has no ulterior selfish ends to serve, that he is gentle, sympathetic, and considerate towards those who oppose him. He strives, not for victory over his opponents, but for truth both for himself and for them; and he knows what it costs to arrive at truth.

We have a noble illustration of this temper in some of the opening passages of St. Augustine's treatise against the so-called Fundamental Letter of Manichæus. He says, "My prayer to the one true God Almighty has been and is, that in refuting and disproving the heresy of you Manichæans, to which you adhere perchance more through thought

lessness than evil intent, He would give me a mind composed and tranquil, and aiming rather at your amendment than your discomfiture. . . Let those rage against you who know not with what toil truth is found, and how difficult it is to avoid errors. . . Let those rage against you who know not with what great difficulty the eye of the inner man is made whole, so that it can behold its Sun. . . Let those rage against you who know not with what sighs and groans it is made possible, in however small a degree, to comprehend God. Finally, let those rage against you who have never been deceived by such an error as that whereby they see you deceived. . . Let neither of us say that he has already found the truth. Let us seek it as if it were unknown to us both. For it can be sought for with zeal and unanimity, only if there be no rash assumption that it has been found and is known."

These words are all the more impressive when we remember that Augustine himself had been a Manichæan, and that converts are usually most bitter against those beliefs from which they have been converted.

Listen to another passage to the same effect, but in a somewhat different key, from a critical writer of our own day, whose collected essays are now being widely read in England. He tells us, in a review of the life of Bishop Warburton, that "by an intellect which is habitually filled with the wisdom which is from heaven in all its length and breadth, 'objections' against religion are perceived at once to proceed from imperfect apprehension. Such an intellect cannot rage against those who give words to such objections. It sees that the objectors do but intimate the partial character of their own knowledge." (Mark Pattison; Essays II. 163),

It will be observed that, while the writer just quoted, speaks of the *intellect*, St James speaks of the *heart*. The difference is not accidental; it is significant of a difference in the point of view. The modern view of wisdom is, that it is a matter which mainly consists in the strengthening and enriching of the intellectual powers. Increase of capacity for acquiring and retaining knowledge; increase in the possession of knowledge; this is what is meant by growth in wisdom. And by knowledge is meant acquaintance with the nature and history of man, and with the nature and history of the universe: all which is the sphere of the intellect rather than of the heart. The purification and development of the moral powers, if not absolutely excluded, is left in the background, and almost out of sight. What St. James says here is indeed fully admitted: the highest wisdom keeps a man from the bitterness of party spirit. But why? Because his superior intelligence and information tell him that the opposition of those who dissent from him is the result of ignorance, which is remedied, not by invective, but by instruction. St. James does not dissent from this view, but he enlarges it. There are other reasons why the truly wise man does not rail at others, or try to browbeat them into silence. Because, while he abhors folly, he loves the fool, and would win him over from his foolish ways; because he desires, not only to impart knowledge, but to increase virtue; and because he knows that strife means confusion, while gentleness is the parent of peace.

The Scriptural view of wisdom does not contradict the modern one, but it is taken from the other side. Among the gifts bestowed at Pentecost the quickening of the moral and spiritual powers is conspicuous, while intellectual advancement is in the background or out of sight. There is nothing in the teaching of Christ or of His Apostles that is hostile to intellectual progress; but neither by His example, nor by the directions which His disciples received or delivered, do we find that culture was regarded as part of, or necessary to, the Gospel. Neither Christ nor any one of His immediate followers came forward as a great promoter of intellectual progress. Why is this? It might be a sufficient answer to say that valuable as such work would have been, there was much more serious and important work to be done. To convert men from sin to righteousness was far more urgent than to improve their minds. But there is more to be said than this. That perverse generation had to "turn and become as little children" before it could enter into the kingdom of heaven; and to develop a man's intellectual powers is not always the best way to make him "humble himself as a little child." Increase of knowledge may make a Newton feel like a child picking up pebbles on the shore of truth, but it is apt to make "the natural man" less childlike. And for none of us is cultivation of the intellect so pressing a duty as cultivation of the heart. "To know all mysteries and all knowledge" is as nothing compared with charity. Man's moral nature certainly suffered, and ruinously suffered, at the Fall. It is not so certain that his intellectual nature suffered also. If it did, it suffered *through* the moral nature, because the depraved heart depraved the brain. If, therefore, loss of innocence has entailed a loss of mental capacity, then the wound inflicted on the moral nature must be healed in the same way. First purify the heart and regenerate the will, and then the recovery of the intellect will follow in due course. It is easy to reach the intellect through the heart, and this is what the wisdom which is from above aims at doing. If we begin with the intellect we shall very likely end there; and in that case the man is not raised from his degradation, but equipped with additional powers of mischief.

Let us bear this in mind when we consider the claims of that General Diocesan Fund, the needs of which are by our bishop's desire being placed before the diocese in many churches to-day. Some of you gave your thank-offerings to it on Ascension

Day. But it is permanent subscriptions rather than casual donations that are needed. Would you widen the influence of that wisdom from above of which the season of Pentecost reminds us so impressively? You can hardly do so more effectually than by giving steady support to a fund, the main object of which is to supply the spiritual, moral, and intellectual needs in the teeming population all around us. St. James tells us that the heavenly wisdom is not only peaceable and gentle, but "full of mercy and good works"; and thus, as so often, he gives us a practical test wherewith to try ourselves. Is our wisdom from above or from below? Just as we have no reason to rejoice in a faith which does not clothe the naked, and feed the hungry, and offer of its best to God, nor in a tongue which blesses God while it rails at men, so we may doubt the heavenly character of a wisdom which refuses to visit the fatherless in their affliction, or to aid in healing the moral plague-spots of the world.

CHRISTIAN UNION.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.,
Rector of Warrenpoint.

Sermon Preached in the Parish Church of Warrenpoint.

"Members one of another."—Rom. xii. 5.

WHAT do we mean by Christian Union? Perhaps we shall better understand what it is if we begin by explaining, What it is not. The Christian Union we are about to treat of does not consist in any compromise between right and wrong, between truth and falsehood, between those who serve God and those who do not. The case of Ahab and Jehoshaphat warns us that we ought not to be too ready to say to our neighbours—"I am as thou art, my people as thy people, my horses as thy horses."

Between light and darkness, between Christ and Antichrist, there can be no communion; he that believeth can have no part with an infidel. Again, Christian Union does not mean the same thing as uniformity. The grains of sand on the seashore may be alike in colour and size and appearance; but there is no real union between them. We do not mean by Christian Union that members of different religious denominations should meet together now and then for religious exercises. These might be held without any real union, and might even lead to disputes, suspicions and distrust. Such meetings have been held for many years, and we do not seem to be any nearer to "the Reunion of Christendom" than before.

The mere drawing together now and then of individuals while the denominations they represent remain divided as widely as ever, is not union, but the pretence of it, and the moment those who take part in such movements attempt to carry their theories into practice they discover how worthless a pretence it is. Christian Union must aim at the creation of unity of organisation. "Now ye are the body of Christ."

The following are the views of the Bishop of Meath:—

"If we are to win disciples to His name, it must be by displaying unity not division, concord not disagreement; in short, it must be by understanding that Christianity is not Presbyterianism, nor Congregationalism, nor Anabaptism, nor any other of the isms into which it is now so unintelligibly to the heathen split; but that as there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God, and Father of all, so there is but one Spirit handed down from age to age, and perpetuated in that succession by which it has pleased the Head of His Church to secure the Unity of His body, not merely in the doctrine of the Apostles, but in their fellowship. In other words, until the various sects of Protestant Christendom shall see that unity of discipline and membership is as important as unity of doctrine, we cannot expect that the fulness of the blessing shall be poured on their efforts."

Before any real advance can be made in a practical direction to secure unity of organisation between episcopal and non-episcopal denominations it would be well to decide whether such reunion can take place without the recognition of the historic episcopate. We need not shrink from controversy as though it were opposed to the idea of unity. We may have the spirit of unity and be desirous of promoting union, and yet defend the truth zealously, for St. Paul writing to the Colossians in an epistle full of controversy, full of definite doctrinal statements, written in a prison, in the midst of persecutions and trials, says—"Let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body, and be ye thankful." Christians are the body of Christ. Each member of the body has a separate duty, and the ear is not the hand nor is the eye the heart. But all are linked together by one common life, united by one common spirit that binds all into one united whole.

Christians are the temple of God. Each stone is built into the one great building of which Jesus Christ is "the chief corner stone," and the unity is secured by this common bond, namely, by the presence of Him that dwelleth within: "In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the spirit." (Eph. ii. 22.)

Christians are the family of God. Thus we see that real union lies in this—that we should have one spirit, one faith, one body. But even here we must be careful lest we set up our own opinions or prejudices as to what is included under these three heads.

The Church must be united in one spirit and

through one spirit; but St. Paul could rejoice when Christ was preached from envy and strife by men who hoped to make His bonds more bitter and to cast contempt on his ministry. Here was forbearance, but not union. To have real union there must be, as among those who believed at Pentecost, "one heart and one soul." Such unity can only be brought about by the Holy Spirit, and must proceed from firm belief in one doctrine. But here, too, we must proceed carefully. Not all errors in doctrine; not all defects in discipline, not all differences in Church government exclude men from the fold of Christ, from the family of God, from that building fitly framed together "for an habitation of God through the Spirit." But let us beware how we trifle with the unity of the Church of God, or how we assume to ourselves the right to dispense with the belief in this or that article of the Christian Faith.

There is a curious legend which has come down from very early times, that the Apostles met together before they went out to preach the Gospel in all lands, and having considered the various doctrines which should form the ground of their future teaching, drew up the Apostles' Creed—each contributing one article to this common profession of faith. Of course, this is not true in point of fact, as we know that this creed is of much later origin, but it shows that in those early days men believed that a common doctrine was necessary as the ground of unity. Wherever the leading truths of the Gospel were denied, there not even the large loving heart of St. John could look for Christian union. "If there come any unto you," he writes, "and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." (2 John 10, 11.) Yet it was this same Apostle who was so full of the divine spirit of charity that another early tradition tells us how, when he was broken down by extreme old age and infirmity, and unable any longer to minister in the congregation, he used to be borne into the midst of the little flock of Christian worshippers to whom he would repeat again and again the words that seemed to be the burden of all his teaching—"Little children love one another." This unity of spirit and unity of doctrine ought to produce unity of organization, "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many are one body, so also is Christ, for, by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. That there should be no schism in the body, but that the members should have the same care one for another." (1 Cor. xii. 12.)

Our Blessed Lord laid great stress on unity. It formed the subject of His intercession in His prayer before the crucifixion:

"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word that they all may be one." He indicated the value of unity by adding "that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." (St. John xvii. 20.)

So also St. John.

"Hereby we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." (1 John iii. 14.)

Similarly St. Paul says—

"For ye are yet carnal, for whereas there is among you envying and strife and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men." (1 Cor. iii. 3.)

It is impossible to over-estimate the power of unity.

It is impossible to over-estimate the dangers of disunion.

Far up on the mountain brow the snow gathers—flake upon flake—each flake like a feather tossed hither and thither by the breeze, light as air, soft as down. But day after day the drift gathers and deepens and hardens, till at last the falling of a rock, or the slipping of a higher snowdrift, or the foot of a mountain goat gives it the necessary movement, and then it thunders down like a mountain torn up by the roots, and sweeps away whole villages in its terrible descent. The members of a body may appear to be weak and of no reputation, but let the Spirit that rules within be a Divine Spirit, and every part of the body becomes of priceless value, whose presence is necessary to the health and beauty and efficiency of the whole, whose loss may imply serious injury, and must cause more or less of weakness to the whole body. Enough has now been said as to the nature of Christian unity, we proceed in the next place to consider its necessity. In a general way people admit that "union is strength," that disunion is a fruitful source of weakness; but then we do not always find that in the practical concerns of life there is the same readiness to act on this principle: "Bear ye one anothers burdens and so fulfil the law of Christ." "The members should have the same care one for another." "Members one of another."

You may remember how in the early ages of the Roman Republic three brothers went out to fight against three champions of another State. Soon two of the Roman youths lay slain, and the survivor found himself attacked by three enemies who had, however, been all more or less seriously wounded. He could not hope to overcome them together, and so he pretended to run away. They followed as fast as their wounds permitted, but as soon as they separated the Roman turned round and defeated each separately until all were slain. The divisions among Christians have been a hindrance to the spread of religion. Chesub Chunder Sen, speaking in London on one occasion said: "So many different doctrines and rituals were presented to the Hindoo by the missionaries of differ-

ing churches that he was quite bewildered and confounded by them." At the time of the Reformation the great hindrance to the spread of the truth was found in the divisions and disputes between various bodies of Reformed Christians. While Calvinists, Lutherans, and Anglicans disputed with one another. Rome quietly made her preparations to devour them all one after another. In our case union is not only a Christian duty, but a necessity, if we are to exist at all. We are few in number, and we are confronted by the Church of Rome in her full vigour and wiliness. "Members one of another." How do you show it? Take the case of our poorer parishes. All over Ireland are to be found parishes where a few members of the Church of Ireland live in the midst of Roman Catholics, exposed to influences hostile to their faith, unable without help to keep their churches open or to provide suitable instruction for their children. If the churches in those outlying districts should be closed, what is to become of the people? Are they to be allowed to drift away into Romanism or irreligion? Are their families to grow up in religious ignorance? Or will those Churchmen in more favoured circumstances, acting on the principle, "Members one of another," reach out a helping hand, and strengthen those parts that are weak? The daughter of a clergyman in the South of Ireland recently told me that as there was no provision in her father's parish for paying a teacher, and no school available for the few Protestant children, except National schools taught by Roman Catholics under the management of the priest, she had opened a class in which for some hours daily she taught the few children belonging to the Church. It seemed to me that she had laid hold of the meaning of the words, "Members one of another." Many persons think that we may see worse times in this country than we have yet experienced when the control of education and other matters which concern us very much shall rest entirely in the hands of the majority. How would that affect our scattered brethren in many an outlying district? It would mean ruin to them unless we act upon the principle, "Members one of another."

In Canada at the present time the contracts made on paper to protect the rights of the Protestant minority are found useless against the determined efforts of the Roman Catholics to impose their will on their fellow citizens. Would we fare better in a country like this, where party spirit is strong, where religious bitterness has been kept alive for political purposes, and where our Church by the very nature of her position as a State Church has been for centuries more or less mixed up in political strife? There is but one way of safety for Irish Protestants in the future, and that way lies in realising and in acting upon the principle, "Members one of another." United they may defy all enemies, and outlive all attacks. Divided, they must perish, cut off in detail; and though the outposts may fall first the assault on the citadel will follow in due course, and the ruin of one will most surely involve the downfall of the other. Reflect upon these things, and as you do so, bear in mind that we are "Members one of another." "By various discipline here He fits and polishes each living stone for the place which it is destined to occupy in the spiritual Temple; and when all the stones are made ready He will build them together each into his place, and exhibit to men and angels their perfect unity. Aaron has been bred under his paternal roof and inured to Egyptian servitude from childhood. Moses has been lapped in royal luxury from his infancy, educated at a court, and then banished into a wilderness. But the time came when these brothers in blood—so dissimilar in training, so opposite in their experience, so different possibly in some of the judgments which they had formed of God's ways—met never to part again in this life. "The Lord said unto Aaron, Go into the wilderness to meet Moses. And he went and met him in the Mount of God, and kissed him." So shall it be with all true Christians, whose history discipline sentiments have here taken a course which seemed far enough asunder. A meeting and a greeting is reserved for all of them in the Mount of God—let them see to it, as Joseph said to his brethren, "that they fall not out by the way."

DEAN OWEN, it is stated, will not take up his residence at St. Asaph until August.

THE Bishop of Chester wore a very handsome cope at his ordination service in Chester Cathedral.

THE Rev. William Wheeler Aldridge, vicar of Emmanuel Church, Weston-super-Mare, was recently collated by the Bishop of Bath and Wells to the prebendal stall of Wedmore 4th in Wells Cathedral, and on the 22nd inst. he was installed in the cathedral with the usual solemnities. At the close of the service a peal was rung on the cathedral bells.

MR. W. ROBERTSON SMITH has been elected to succeed his friend and compatriot, the late Dr. W. Wright, as Professor of Arabic at Cambridge; it is understood that he will immediately place his resignation of the Librarianship in the hands of the Vice-Chancellor, but it may not be convenient that it should take immediate effect. There is a curious mode of election to this office, as the Council of the Senate nominate two of the candidates within fourteen days of the vacancy occurring; the election, which goes by the votes of the members of the Senate, is held on the day following the nomination. Mr. F. J. H. Jenkinson, of Trinity, will be a candidate for the post; other names have been mentioned, but there is no one else in regard to whom it is definitely known whether he will stand or not.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly
CURED
by simply using the
AMMONIAPHONE
FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.
21s. post free.
WILL LAST FOR YEARS.
Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials may be had FREE OF CHARGE on application to Medical Battery Co. Ld.
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1889.

COMUS CIRCA SACRA.

THE churches find a difficulty in making ends meet and providing for expenses, extraordinary if not ordinary; so novel and sensational means are resorted to, more and more piquant as old expedients pall on the popular taste for raising funds.

The difficulty is not new, nor the makeshifts for meeting it so new as might be thought. In the "ages of faith," when our grand cathedrals grew, do we think it was all spontaneous work, that individuals and communities were possessed with a spirit of giving? no "love of nicely-calculated less or more" in those days? but churchmen and laymen vying with one another in the largeness of their gifts?

We question if our own day present not as splendid instances of individual munificence as any before it. De Thorsby, in the fourteenth century, spent what now would be from thirty to forty thousand pounds on York Minster. De Losinga, in the twelfth, built Norwich Cathedral and the great Church in Lynn. But bishops now-a-days have spent their whole episcopal and literary incomes on church-work, living wholly within their private means; and laymen and ladies have given tens or even hundreds of thousands at a time, or have left charitable or religious bequests by the quarter or the half of a million sterling.

And, on the other hand, in the good old times, in many instances, "nothing was to be had for nothing" any more than now. Liberality was artificially stimulated by indulgences, and the idea of merit with future recompense largely attaching to benefactions to religion, many an one was "rich in good works," but *not* "hoping for nothing again."

The former times were not, perhaps, better than these. But that is no reason for not bettering our own days and ways. To match the error of the present with one out of the past is not the way to make moral progress.

What ought to be Christian liberality is excited by such *outré* methods. An archdeacon (since made a dean) complained that his official query, How are your Church expenses met? had for one answer, "The offertory, entertainments, balls, etc." Comic singing, songs "in character," comedy itself, burlesques, nigger minstrels, and *id genus omne*, are resorted to, in town and village, to beguile Christian people into keeping up God's House and providing for God's worship.

Into the intrinsic rightness or wrongness of some of these things we do not now enter. Man is the laughing animal, and *dulce est desipere in loco.* "A merry heart doeth good like a medicine." God never gave man his sense of humour only to be mortified. "Fools make a mock at sin; and fun is sinful only when sin is found amusing." We speak now but of the fitness of things, not of Comus as unclean, but of Comus *circa sacra* as incongruous. As the *Standard* once had it of certain Sunday doings: "There are spectacles and amusements which, while perfectly innocent and even improving in themselves, are inconsistent with the frame of mind we would preserve on Sunday." What is there said of holy time may be applied to holy place and purpose, that in association with these latter there are things which are inconsistent.

Is it not humiliating that before people, nominally Christians, will *give* half-a-crown, they must spend ten shillings on what is not worth a tenth of it — not to the purchasers who don't want it—in order to have something to show themselves for their money; that before their florin or so can filter into the Lord's treasury they must, as *quid pro quo*, have had their ears tickled with tomfoolery?

Church and chapel, it is to be feared, cannot in this matter throw a stone either at other. What place of worship was it that the other day advertised a "screaming farce" as part of its bazaar programme?

The "gravity" of deacons and presbyters is apostolically insisted on—not censure of the native wit that, like the lambent lightning of summer plays round the lip and twinkling eye of many a reverend divine, making his company the more genial and even his Gospel the more cogent, for a dash of dry humour in the pulpit and of light pleasantry on the platform, helps speech or sermon to the mark like the feather on an arrow; but censure of a levity felt as a false note in one separated unto God. "If you are always making fun," says the author of *Ars Pastoralis*, "you force

people to think that your habitual thoughts are about pleasantries, about the things of this world—in fact, rather than about heavenly things. . . . If God gives a man wit, why should he not use it? On the other hand, if a dying man were to send for a clergyman, would he send for the witty man, however good he might be, or for the less witty one? And the Bible says a good deal about gravity as a requisite of a minister."

The author of the *Complete Duty of Man* threw down his bat when ordained sooner than ever hear, "Well hit, parson." He was wrong; the body is an integral part of man, and athletics a means of getting into touch with some men, especially the young, if it be but as the impact of balls at first, touching at one point, to lead on to a contact as of bricks "builded together." Yet he was right in the righteous instinct that the "man of God" should preserve his sacred character, nor court the "familiarity that breeds contempt." I conclude with two or three extracts:

"The country parson," saith George Herbert, "is generally sad, because he knows nothing but the Cross of Christ, his mind being defixed on it with those nails wherewith his Master was; or if he have any leisure to look off from thence he meets continually with two most sad spectacles, sin and misery, God dishonoured every day, and man afflicted. Nevertheless he sometimes refresheth himself, as knowing that nature will not bear everlasting droopings, and that pleasantness of disposition is a great key to good, not only because all men shun the company of perpetual severity, but also for that when they are in company, instructions seasoned with pleasantness both enter sooner and root deeper. Wherefore he condescends to human frailties both in himself and others, and intermingles some mirth in his discourses occasionally, according to the pulse of the hearer."

And this *locus classicus:*

"Christian saw the picture of a very grave person hang up against the wall, and this was the fashion of it. It had eyes lifted up to heaven; the best of books in its hand; the law of truth was written upon its lips; the world was behind its back; it stood as if it pleaded with men; and a crown of gold did hang over its head."

Or this:

"I would express him simple, grave, sincere;
In doctrine uncorrupt; in language plain,
And plain in manner—decent, solemn, chaste,
And natural in gesture; much impressed
Himself as conscious of his awful charge,
And anxious mainly that the flock he feeds
May feel it too; affectionate in looks
And tender in address, as well becomes
A messenger of peace to guilty men."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—I am glad Mr. Donaldson manifests a readiness to discuss the most important question that can engage the human attention.

I beg to say that I, as an universalist, do not deny any of the revealed attributes of God. I recognise clearly that He is not only the Father, but also the wise and righteous Ruler of His intelligent creatures. But it seems evident to me that, as a wise and righteous Ruler, He must necessarily take such measures as will remove disorder, vice, and crime from the universe, which a perpetuation of sin and misery would not effect.

Mr. Donaldson quotes certain texts, in all which, so far as I have been able to gather the meaning of the original words, endlessness is not asserted.

I beg to submit the following texts, in the hope of eliciting opinions as to their meaning:—

Col. i. 16-20: "Having made peace through the blood of His Cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself."

Eph. i. 10: "Gather together in one all things in Christ."

John xii 32: "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me."

Phil. iii. 21: "According to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself."

I suppose it is a good maxim to compare one part of Scripture with another, in order to ascertain the meaning of the whole. The Bishop of Manchester said the declaration by the Saviour of the Fatherhood of God is the master-thought which will harmonise all texts now apparently contradictory to many minds. So, likewise, it seems to me that all texts must be shown to be in agreement with the grand proclamation, "God is love."

The idea of limited castigation for beneficent objects is in harmony with those two regulative thoughts, but not a belief in endless depravity and misery.

J. B.

Canonbury, 22nd June, 1889.

SIR,—There are some people who unconsciously colour other people and things through the medium of their own taste and preconception. This is an evil which everyone duly sensible of his obligations to others will try to rectify in himself. Bad as it is when our fellow-creatures are the object of it, it is much worse when exercised towards the Deity, because we then tarnish the lustre of His perfections by attributing to Him human weaknesses.

This mental inclination—to call it by no harder name—is the root of the notion that lost souls will be liberated from their eternal punishment. Men have reasoned thus: I would not keep lost souls there always; I would correct, amend, and liberate them, and if *I* would do this, surely God will do it.

The implied premise in this reasoning is that if man would do a good thing, how much more would God do it. Its validity, however, depends on what is meant by a "good thing." That it be good it must be just, and to know it to be just we must attend to what God has said concerning it, because He *alone*, being infinitely wise, knows the demerit of sin; and He alone, being infinitely just, knows what punishment it deserves. He has said that that punishment will be eternal. No amount of preconception nor abstract speculation can set this aside.

Though He is called Father by right of creation, and on account of temporal redemption and visible Church-membership; a Father to those who are spiritually regenerated, and of those who attain to a joyful Resurrection, yet He is never called the Father of lost souls *as such*. The inference is plain. By their conduct on earth they have lost the title to the privileges implied in this relationship. And the order

of grace is from sonship on earth to sonship in heaven, from the Church militant to the Church triumphant. There is no intermediate place of sonship. We never read of sonship in hell, nor of passing from it to sonship in heaven. To go to heaven men must *die* in the faith of Christ. "Blessed are the dead which *die* in the Lord." "Be thou faithful unto *death*, and I will give thee a crown of *life*." "With whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence *in* the Lord." Hence the saints in heaven, though they give thanks for having been redeemed out of "every kindred and tongue and people and nation," never make mention of having been liberated from hell. And the reason of this is plain—"they washed their robes and made them white in the *Blood of the Lamb*." And every-one can do as they did; hence there is no *need* for purgatorial corrections.

This argument of the natural Fatherhood of the Deity proves nothing, because it proves too much. It would involve the restoration to bliss of the devil himself.

It is the merest figment to say that God's punishments are always corrective. We read of people "to whom is reserved the mist of darkness for *ever*," and of people "on whom the *wrath* of God *abideth*."

Election implies the selection of some and the rejection of others out of a class presented for choice; and to speak of the election of a *whole* race, when there was no other race to come into *comparison* with it, is an abuse of language.

It is as false in religion as in philosophy, for election to eternal life—the only election that we are speaking of at present—is made conditional on repentance and faith; and those that perform the conditions are elected, and those that do not are rejected. And there is no place in which we can "cast off the works of darkness, and put upon us the armour of light," except "in *the time of this mortal life*."

If the whole human race be the "lump" in Rom. xi. 16, then it would follow that the whole human race is *holy*. A flagrantly absurd idea! And if they be holy, why subject them to correction in the place of outer darkness? This is more absurd still! When they are holy, why not pass them on to heaven *direct?* This would be a rational and Scriptural pro ceeding. The remark of Olshausen on this verse will, perhaps, save me the trouble of saying anything more on it at present. He says: "These roots, or first-fruits, are, of course, the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (ver. 28); because they are holy, their *seed*, the *natural* Israel, must also be holy." St. James's firstfruits are those who had been "begotten by the word of truth," which is the Gospel of Christ; consequently he cannot refer to the "elect Israel" as such, because it is a notorious fact that they rejected Christ.

The reference to Darwin only puts a person in mind of how prone some people are to follow false Christs and false Apostles. Analogies between nature and grace are very useful in showing the operation of spiritual things, but it is impossible to bring about a spiritual result from a physical cause. If you have a good sire and a good dame, you will in all probability have a healthy offspring; but spiritual qualities, in which the regeneration of the race consists, are not communicated from sire to son. They can be obtained in only one way, that is, from the Spirit of God; and this is God's way of regenerating the race by bringing them into contact with Himself by faith in Christ. Good men are only secondary means in this great work, and very often impotent too. "Though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, they should deliver but their *own* souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God."

And to talk of a "vengeance which has no purpose beyond itself" is trying to be wise above what is written, for "He hath made even the wicked for the day of His wrath." And to write thus looks very much like "rushing in where angels fear to tread."

R. DONALDSON.

Fintona, June 20th, 1889.

REMARKS ON A SERMON.

SIR,—I see you do not object to criticisms on sermons sent to you for publication. Allow me to make a few on one, in your number for June 8: "The Evening of the Resurrection." What I object to in this sermon, is its statement that our Lord's Risen and glorified Body is "freed from the limitations that confine and regulate the movements of our material frames." This conclusion is built on St. Paul's term "a spiritual body." But St. Paul was speaking of resurrection bodies generally, and of our Lord's only as being the first fruits. That resurrection bodies do not pass through rocks, walls, doors, etc., is plain, because the graves were first opened for the dead to appear. I see that absurdity is not produced in this sermon, that our Lord's Body passed through the rock, though it appears in Ritualistic books generally, as "The Christian Passover." If our Lord appeared to His Apostles after the doors were closed, "for fear of the Jews," this proves nothing as to how He entered. The door might have been opened, as for St. Peter. But this is of no consequence, even if His Body miraculously passed through wall or door, this proves nothing except the same power which enabled Him to walk on the water, and to pass unseen through multitudes before His death. This has nothing at all to do with what the sermon asserts as to His Risen Body being freed from the limitations that confine and regulate the movements of our material frames. Of course there is no limit to the movements of our Lord's Body now, as there was not either to its movements before His death. The writer says: "It was now a spiritua Body"; again, "it was a body so assimulated to spiritual existence, that wherever the spirit willed it to be there it was." A body assimilated to a spiritual existence is much as if I said "a spirit assimilated to a bodily existence." In fact it is a contradiction, not to say, nonsense. He seems to explain "a spiritual body as a body capable of dispensing spiritual gifts." This would be very reasonable. His Body does now from heaven dispense spiritual gifts. A spiritual body whatever it is, is bound by the laws that confine and regulate the presence, if not the movements of our material frames. What is limited by the 4th Article and the Black Rubric is not the movements, but the material presence of our Lord's glorified Body. To its movements, neither Scripture nor our formularies, put limits. What they *do* limit is its local material presence. If the preacher means to say that our Lord's glorified Body is now in ninety places at once, and has actual contact with our bodies in the Eucharist, this is contrary to our formularies. If he means merely that the movements of our Lord's Body are whithersoever He wills it to be, so that by a miracle it can pass through all impediments, no one objects, except that Scripture is silent. But all this has nothing to say to what He seems driving at, that His

Spiritual Body is ubiquitous, which even spirits themselves are not.

Before I conclude I must glance at a theory, which, perhaps, the preacher had in view. Newman had it in his Tract No. 90, and also in his letter to Faussett, 1838—I mean that our Lord's Body may move with incredible velocity. The idea of His Body flying from altar to altar—millions of them through Christendom, is as monstrous as it is profane. Whether this is what the preachers meant by limitations of movement, I know not. Much better if Newman and his followers had kept to his other illustration of the sun and the stars being present by influence, but distant as to locality. But this is now scorned, and nicknamed as virtualism. It was thought very good in Tract No. 90, and it is equally good now.

A PROTESTANT.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE THIRD GOSPEL AND OF THE ACTS.

SIR,—The long-wished-for edition of Dr. Lightfoot's essays on "Supernatural Religion," which originally appeared in the *Contemporary Review*, is at last out, and the Bishop of Durham has added to them an Appendix on the Acts of the Apostles. It opens thus :—

"In a former volume M. Renan declared his opinion that 'the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts was verily and indeed Luke, a disciple of St. Paul.' In the last instalment of his work he condemns as untenable the view that the first person plural of the later chapters is derived from some earlier document inserted by the author on the ground that these portions are identical in style with the rest of the work. Such an expression of opinion, proceeding from a not too conservative critic, is significant; and *this view of the authorship, I cannot doubt, will be the final verdict of the future, as it has been the unbroken tradition of the past.*"

Dr. Lightfoot wrote thus in 1878, and he repeats it with as much confidence in 1889. The present volume, which is not a mere reprint of the essays in the *Contemporary Review*, altogether ignores the suggestion that the Acts may have been written by St. Paul. It is to be hoped that the volume will have a very wide circulation.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Durham, June 20th, 1889.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alder, Rev. E., M.A., Rector of Steventon, Hants.
Aldridge, Rev. William Wheeler, Vicar of Emmanuel Church, Weston-super-Mare; Prebendary of Wedmore, fourth in Wells Cathedral.
Bignold, Rev. F. E., Vicar of Wield, Hants.
Blackwood, Rev. John O'Reilly, Missions to Seamen Chaplain for Cork Harbour; Missions to Seamen Chaplain for Portland Roads.
Browne, Rev. George Rickards, M.A., Rector of Iron Acton, Gloucestershire.
Caldecott, Rev. Alfred, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; Junior Dean of St. John's College.
Catterall, Rev. Robert, Diocesan Missioner; Rector of St. Mary's, Crumpsall, Manchester.
Davies, Rev. Thomas Zephaniah, M.A., Vicar of Whitford, Holywell; Rural Dean of Holywell.
Ford, Rev. William Owen Parker, M.A., Rector of St. John's, Bedford.
Gent, Rev. G. W., Principal of St. Mark's College, Chelsea; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Carmarthenshire.
Gladstone, Rev. Stephen Edward, M.A., Rector of Hawarden, Chester; Rural Dean of Mold.
Hamilton, Rev. C. H., B.A., Vicar of Holybourne, Hants.
Howell, Rev. Canon David, Vicar of Wrexham; Rural Dean of Wrexham.
Jeudwine, Rev. G. W., Rector of Niton, Isle of Wight; Rector of Harlaxton St. Mary, Grantham.
Jones, Rev. Bulkeley Owen, M.A., Warden and Vicar of Ruthin; Rural Dean of Dyffryn Clwyd.
Jones, Rev. Canon Hugh, M.A., Rector of Llanwrst; Rural Dean of Llanwrst.
Jones, Rev. Llewelyn Wynne, M.A., Vicar of Chirk, Ruabon; Rural Dean of Llangollen.
Lewis, Rev. David, Rector of Llangyniew, Welshpool; Rural Dean of Caereinion.
Lewis, Rev. D. J., B.A., Rector of Llanidan, Anglesey; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Rural Deanery of Menai.
Lewis, Rev. David Phillips, M.A., Rector of Llandrinio, Oswestry; Rural Dean of Pool.
McGill, Rev. George Henry, M.A., Rector of Bangor-is-y-coed, Wrexham; Rural Dean of Bangor-is-y-coed.
Mitton, Rev. A. T., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Markyate-street, Herts.
Monro, Rev. R., B.A., Assistant Chaplain of St. Thomas's Diocesan Home, Basingstoke.
Over, Rev. Elisha, Vicar of St. Saviour's, Preston.
Packer, Rev. Charles, B.A., Curate of Christ Church, Chester; Vicar of Dane Bridge, Northwich.
Pym, Rev. W. R., M.A., Vicar of Wentworth; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Sharrow, Sheffield.
Reade, Rev. Compton, Chaplain of the Hereford County and City Asylum.
Richardson, Rev. Canon William, M.A., Rector of Corwen; Rural Dean of Penllyn and Edeirnion.
Rogers, Rev. J. H., M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Thorpe Hamlet, Norwich.
Sanctuary, Rev. C. Ll., Vicar of West Fordington, Dorchester; Vicar of Powerstock, Dorset.
Smart, Rev. D. C., Vicar of Milborne St. Andrew's, Blandford.
Stracey, Rev. W. J., Chaplain to Colonel Stracey-Clitherow, First High Sheriff of Middlesex.
Smith, Rev. D. G. F., Curate of the Wilberforce Memorial Church (St. Mark's), Camberwell; Junior Incumbent of St. Paul's, St. Paul's-square, Liverpool.
Wardale, Rev. John Joseph, B.A., Rector of Dalbury, Derbyshire.
Watkin, Rev. Herbert Williams, M.A., Prebendary of Llanefyad (Chancellor of the Cathedral) in St. Asaph's Cathedral.
West, Rev. Henry Matthew, M.A., Rector of Sacomb, Herts.
White, Rev. G. Cecil, Vicar of St. Paul's, Southampton; Rector of Nursling, Hants.
Williams, Rev. David, Rector of Llandyrnog, Denbigh; Rural Dean of Denbigh.
Williams, Rev. John, Rector of Newtown; Rural Dean of Caedewen.
Williams, Rev. Canon Robert, M.A., Rector of Llanfyllen, Montgomeryshire; Rural Dean of Llanfyllen.
Yates, Rev. Arthur G., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Comus*.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bowcott, Rev. Richard, at Llawhaden Vicarage, Narberth, suddenly, on the 20th inst., aged 64.
Bowyer, Rev. F. W. Atkyns, formerly Rector of Clapham, at Harpsden Court, Henley-on-Thames, on the 17th inst., aged 49.
Collison, Rev. F. W. P., B.D., late Rector of Marwood, N. Devon, at 61, Dartmouth-park-hill, N.W.
Cook, Rev. Frederick Charles, Canon of Exeter, Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen, and formerly Preacher at Lincoln's-inn, at the Close, Exeter, on the 22nd inst., aged 84.
Cope, Rev. William Rogers, at Kent House, Wandsworth-common, on the 21st inst., aged 73.
Dolphin, Rev. John, Rector for fifty-nine years, and late Rural Dean of Repps, at Antingham, Norfolk, on the 21st inst., in his 85th year.
Fisher, Rev. E. R., formerly Vicar of Swallowfield, afterwards Assistant-Chaplain at Nice, on the 19th inst., aged 57.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 028229240